

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, April, 1894.

PECOCK'S 'REPRESSOR' AND THE WICLIF BIBLE.

IN the introduction to his edition of Pecock's 'Repressor' for the Rolls Series, Churchill Babington makes the following assertion:

"In the majority of Scripture citations, Pecock employs the version ascribed to Wiclif, in that form of it, however, which is the later of the two. . . ." (*Introduction*, p. xxviii.)

He adds in a note:

"See 'Repressor,' part v, ch. i, more especially. The exceptions to this remark are mostly confined to short texts quoted apparently *memoriter*, such as occur in the first sixty pages."

A somewhat careful comparison of the Scripture citations in the 'Repressor' with the Wiclif Bible reveals the fact that of about one hundred and fifty passages, but thirty-two are quoted exactly. Of course the phrase, "employs the version ascribed to Wiclif," may admit very wide divergence from that version, and might be extended to mere paraphrase. In that sense, Pecock may be said to employ the Wiclif version, but it is doubtful if in any other sense. Yet the editor's use of the word "quoted" in his note implies a much more limited meaning in his phrase than I have suggested.

His statement, however, that the remark is especially true of the fifth part, first chapter, must be confirmed without qualification. From this point to the close, the citations are nearly exact. But it must be remembered that this is less than one-sixth of the work. Nor is it to be inferred that all the exact or nearly exact citations are to be found in this fifth part, as they are distributed pretty evenly through the two volumes?

The second statement of Mr. Babington's note is more doubtful. It can hardly be proved that the exceptions to his introductory remark "are mostly confined to short texts quoted apparently *memoriter*, such as occur in the first sixty pages." All but one of the examples of maximum divergence given below have been chosen from the first sixty pages,

and cannot, I think, fail to raise the question whether they can be satisfactorily accounted for by the theory of *memoriter* quotations. If they may, it is only by a greater extension of the term "quotation" than is ordinarily made. Nor are such divergences confined to the first sixty pages, for at page 389 (Wisdom, 5. 16) and at page 440 (Matt. 16. 16-19) are divergences as great as any that I have instanced. It must, however, be admitted that the longer citations are more accurate than the shorter ones, and that, as the work proceeds, a greater exactness in quotation is evident.

The following collated passages are designed, therefore, to raise the question whether, under any ordinary conception of the term "quotation," Pecock may be said to have quoted from the Wiclif Bible; that is, whether such wide divergence was voluntary or involuntary, and, if the former, on what theory it can be explained.

EXAMPLES OF AVERAGE DIVERGENCE.

Luke 6. 42. 'Repressor,' p. 3.

Pecock—"Ypocrite, take first the beam out of thine owne ige and thanne thou schalt se forto take the mote out of thin neighboris ige."

*Wiclif.—"Ipocrite, first take out the beem of thin ige, and thanne thou schalt se to take the moot of thi brotheris ige."

Jas. 1. 21. 'Repressor,' p. 68.

Pecock.—"Take ge or receyue ge this graffid word which may saue goure soulis."

Wiclif.—"Resseyue ge the word that is plauntid that may saue goure soulis."

John 8. 31. 'Repressor,' p. 103.

Pecock.—"Iesus seid to hem¹ of the Iewis, whiche bileeueden to² him: 'If ge schulens dwelle in my word ge schulen be my very disciplis and ge schulen knowe trouthe⁴ and trouthe schal delyueres gou.'"

¹ A MS. of the earlier version of Wiclif's Bible has *hem, the*.—² Earlier version, *in to*.—³ Earlier version, *schulens dwelle*.—⁴ A MS. of the later version omits *the*.—⁵ Earlier version, *delyuere*.

* I quote in every case from the later Wiclif version.

Wiclif.—"Jhesus seide to the¹ Jewis, that bileueden in² hym, 'If ge dwellen³ in my word, verili ge schulen be my disciplis; and ge schulen knowe the⁴ treuthe, and the treuthe schal makes gou fre.'"

John 3. 19, 20. 'Repressor,' p. 97.

Pecock.—"This is the judgement, for ligt came in to the world, and men loued more derknis than ligt, sotheli¹ her werkis weren yuel. Forsothe² ech that doith yuel hatith ligt, and he comith not to ligt, that hise werkis ben not vndernome.³ He that doith treuthe cometh to ligt, that hise werkis be mad open, for⁴ that thei ben doon in God."

Wiclif.—"And this is the dom, for ligt cam in to the world, and men loueden more derknissis than ligt; for¹ her werkes were yuell. For² ech man that doith yuele, hatith the ligt; and he cometh not to the ligt, that hise werkes be not repreued.³ But he that doith treuthe, cometh to the ligt, that hise werkes be schewid, that⁴ thei ben don in God,"

EXAMPLES OF MINIMUM DIVERGENCE.

II Tim. 4. 2. 'Repressor,' p. 1.

Pecock.—"Vndirnyne thou, biseche thou, and blame thou in al pacience and doctrine."

Wiclif.—"Repreue thou, biseche thou, blame thou in al pacience and doctryn."

Gen. 41. 26, 27. 'Repressor,' p. 258.

Pecock.—"The vij faire kijn and the vij ful eeris of corn ben vij geeris of plente; and the vij kijn thynne and leene, whiche stieden up after tho, and the vij thinne eeris of corn and smytyn with brennyng wijnd ben vij geeris of hungir to comyng."

Wiclif.—"Seuene faire kiyn, and seuene ful eeris of corn, ben seuene geeris of plentee . . . ; and seuene kiyn thinne and leene, that stieden aftir tho and seuene thinne eeris of corn and smytyn with brennyng wynd, ben seuene geer of hungur to comynge. . . ."

Col. 2. 5, 7. 'Repressor,' p. 232.

Pecock.—"Thoug y be absent in bodi, git bi spirit y am with gou, ioiying and seyng goure

¹ Earlier version, *forsoth*.—² Earlier version, *sothe*. *li*.—³ Earlier version, *repreued or undirnomun*.—⁴ Earlier version, *for*.

ordre and the sadnes of goure bileue which is in Crist."

Wiclif.—"For thoug Y be absent in bodi, bi spirit y am with gou, ioiying and seyng goure ordre and the sadnesse of goure bileue that is in Crist."

I Cor. 14. 38. 'Repressor,' p. 53.

Pecock.—"Sotheli,¹ if eny man unknowith, he schal be unknowun."

Wiclif.—"And¹ if ony man unknowith he schal be unknowen."

EXAMPLES OF MAXIMUM DIVERGENCE.

II Cor. 4. 3, 4. 'Repressor,' p. 54.

Pecock.—"That and if oure Euangelie is couered, it is couered to hem whiche spillen; in which¹ God of this world hath blindid the myndis or wittis of unfeithful men, that the ligitng or cleering of the Euangelie of the glorie of Crist, which is the ymage of God, schine not."

Wiclif.—"For if also ouere gospel is kyuerid, in these that perischen it is kyuerid; in which¹ God hath blent the soulis of vnfeithful men of this world, that the ligitnyng of the gospel of the glorie of Crist, which is the ymage of God, schyne not."

Rom. 10. 12. 'Repressor,' p. 2.

Pecock.—"¹zeel of good wille but not aftir kunnyng."

Wiclif.—"¹loue of God, but not aftir kunnynng."

Isa. 66. 2. 'Repressor,' p. 6.

Pecock.—"To whom schal y beholde¹ but to a² litle pore man, broken in herte, and³ trembling at my wordis?"

Wiclif.—"To whom schal y beholde¹ no but to a² pore man and contrit in spirit and³ greetli dredynge my wordis?"

Prov. 25. 16, 27. 'Repressor,' p. 68.

¹ Earlier version, *Forsothe*.

¹ Vulgate—*Deus hujus saeculi*.

¹ No MS. of Wiclif has. "²zeel of good wille." Vulgate, *aemulationem Dei*.

¹ Earlier version, *but*.—² Earlier version, *my porelet*.—³ Earlier version, *trembling my wordis*. Vulgate, *pauperculum, et contritum spiritu, et tremmentem sermones meos*.

Pecock.—“Thou hast founde hony, ete therof what is ynoug and no more; lest thou ouer fillid caste it up out agen and thanne is it to thee vilonie: Forto ete miche of hony is not good to the eter.”

Wiclif.—“Thou hast founde hony, ete thou that that suffisith to thee: lest peraventure thou be fillid, and brake it out. As it is not good to hym that etith myche hony.”

A gleam of light may be thrown on the problem by the fact that, in four of the twelve instances given above, Pecock's variations agree exactly, or very nearly, with the reading of one or more manuscripts of the earlier version of the Wiclif Bible.

It is with some hesitation that I advance the following theory: that, in the case of maximum divergence, we have in Pecock practically a new translation, based probably upon Wiclif; in the case of minimum divergence, we have citations made *memoriter*, in some instances, at least, with the Vulgate in mind; in the case of average divergence, we must hesitate between these two extremes.

It is interesting to note Pecock's evident preference for *which* as a relative, over *that*. In no less than twenty instances he uses the former where Wiclif employs the latter. Examples may be found among the citations given above (cf. Jas. 1. 21; John 8. 31; Gen. 41. 26, 27; Col. 2. 5, 7; II Cor. 4. 3, 4).

CHARLES H. A. WAGER.

Yale University.

THE TEXT OF FAUST.

II. 718 f.

PROFESSOR Cutting in a 'Note to Goethe's Faust' in the February number of the MOD. LANG. NOTES calls in question the punctuation of lines 718 and 719 as given in the standard Weimar edition:

“Zu diesem Schritt sich heiter zu entschliessen
Und, w^or es mit Gefahr, ins Nichts dahin zu fliesen.”

The basis of this edition is Goethe's final revision in the 'Ausgabe letzter Hand,' and the editors sought simply to reproduce the text as Goethe wished to leave it, and to which he dedicated the most painstaking attention. They permitted themselves only

minor changes in punctuation, where manifest errors or inconsistencies occurred. Peculiarities of fashion in the typography of the time were not needlessly set aside. The texts of Faust which are to be considered in determining any reading, are the editions of the collected works of 1808 (A) Bd. viii, of 1817 (B). Bd. ix, of 1828 (C₁) Bd. xii, of 1829 (C) Bd. xii, and the two single editions of 1808 (E₁) and of 1816 (E₂). The text of the latter had Goethe's special revision; and was followed in B and C₁, while C was subjected to a second careful revision. Other editions can be disregarded, at least so far as determining the text of the First Part is concerned.

I have not the single edition of 1816, but as it was followed in the text of 1817, I assume that the two correspond. All these editions present the reading given above. The first complete edition of Faust of 1833 and the collected edition of the poet's works of 1836-7, published under the editorship of Eckermann and Riemer, agree with the above. We must regard the reading, therefore, as authoritative. Von Loeper in his two Hempel editions does not attempt to reproduce the original punctuation, and Düntzer is endlessly arbitrary in his treatment of Goethe's text, changing not only the punctuation, but often the forms of words, basing his course upon some subjective canon. The punctuation is not uniform in Schröder's two editions. We cannot speak of "the change from the Hempel edition," for the Weimar edition, followed by Professor Thomas, preserves properly the original reading. The interpretation of the passage by the author of the note is unquestionably correct, but the text as preserved is undoubtedly that of Goethe.

The punctuation employed is common throughout the literature. A pirated edition of 1810 presents first the reading proposed. The question may, perhaps, be raised, whether in many cases of the similar use of *und*, its purpose may not have been originally to repeat with emphasis the preceding line, equal in the above passage to, "And [to do this], even at the peril of annihilation."

The question what principles should determine the text of a modern classical writer, is one upon which scholars may hold different

views. Shall we reproduce the original form of the text with its unregulated orthography and its caprices of editors and proof-readers, or shall we adopt the final form in which the author left his work? If we take any play of Goethe or almost any poem, we find that the spelling of words and the punctuation have gone through successive changes, any one of which represents simply the fashion of the time, based upon no uniform or consistent principle, and subject to change in the edition of a few years later. We must study the language of the young Goethe in the first edition of 'Götz,' but the play as we read it presents the forms of a half-century or more later. The first is instructive, the last is final. But within the period since Goethe's death the orthography has changed still further. Shall we still spell the forms of *sein*, 'to be,' *sey* and *seyd*, and the plural of *Brett Breter*, or shall we change them? If we admit this revision in one case, why not do so consistently throughout the entire text, doing away with a multiplicity of needless marks, and subjecting words and forms to a regulated system?

On the other hand, we may follow the present standard orthography, with the aim to establish in the pupil's mind certain prescribed forms, not always consistent, it is true, but representing correct usage at the present time. Were all students advanced, a historical text would be demanded, but then we are met by the query which historical text shall be followed, the original, or a subsequent edition, or the final revision? For ordinary school use, I should prefer a revised orthography, preserving in the notes, or in a text-apparatus at the end, interesting and suggestive changes in readings. In the case of works read mainly by advanced pupils, an exact reprint of the author's text is preferable. Minor orthographic differences will then present little difficulty, and are often full of instruction. The Weimar editors had no choice in their task of preparing a standard edition. Had they undertaken the revision of the text upon the basis of the present forms of the language, it would not have represented the language of the poet, and would have afforded no permanent guide to subsequent generations.

W. T. HEWETT.

Cornell University.

A FABLIAUX FABLE.

OLD French literature, in addition to its numerous *Ysopets*, possesses several fables which are anonymous and form a part of no regular collection. To this class belongs a poem, half *fabliaux*, half fable, which occurs in the following MSS.:

1. B. N. f. 837, fo. 236-237
2. B. N. f. 1593, fo. 181-182
3. B. N. f. 2173, *Ysopet* No. 103
4. B. N. f. 25545, fo. 70^{ro}-70^{vo}
5. Berne (*B. Bongarsiana*) 354, fo. 63^a-64^a
6. Berlin, Hamilton 459, fo. 31^d-32^b

We have no indications whatever to assist us in assigning it to any given author, but the date of its composition must be placed at a period not later than 1275. This latter point is established by the fact that our two oldest MSS. (Hamilton 459, and B. N. f. 25545) must be assigned to about that date.¹

True to its double character, this poem is sometimes found associated in the MSS. with *fabliaux*, and sometimes with fables. Thus in the first, fifth and sixth of the MSS. mentioned above, it occurs in a collection of *fabliaux*; in the second and the fourth also among *fabliaux*, yet at some distance from the *Ysopet* of Marie de France which the MS. likewise contains; while in the third MS. it is actually included among the fables of Marie's *Ysopet* according to the *Index*, but is found *after* the regular epilogue in the MS. itself.

Another point of special interest in regard to this poem is the fact that it is distinctly mentioned in another Old French poem, which is contained in the following MSS.:

1. B. N. f. 837, fo. 213^{vo}-214^{ro}
2. B. N. f. 19152, fo. 69^{vo}-70^{ro}
3. Berne (*B. Bongarsiana*) 354, fo. 65^b-67^a
4. B. M. Addit. 15211, fo. 163^b-168^b (xviii^c).²

This is the more remarkable as it is very seldom that we have direct contemporary testimony for a poem of such small compass. Thus, too, we have it established that the poem just mentioned is of later date than the other one, which was evidently more popular.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

Johns Hopkins University.

¹ Cf. *Romania* xii, 209; xiii, 630. Also Hervieux, 'Fabulistes Latins,' vol. i, pp. 623-626.

² Frequently published; cf. Montaiglon, 'Recueil Général des Fabliaux,' t. i, pp. 1-12 (ref. p. 11, l. 293); and Bartsch-Horning, 'La Langue et la Littérature Françaises,' cols. 609-618: "Des Deus Bordoers Ribanz" (ref. col. 616, l. 36).

STRAY VERSE.

I.

IN 1836 was published a volume which may or may not be well known to English students, and to which an additional reference cannot be altogether wanting in value. The printed title-page of the volume reads as follows:

A series of ancient Allegorical, Historical, and Legendary Paintings, in fresco, discovered, in the summer of 1804, on the walls of the Chapel of the Trinity, belonging to the Gild of the Holy Cross, at Stratford-on-Avon, in Warwickshire, from drawings made, at the time of their discovery, by Thomas Fisher, F. S. A.—also, A Plan of the Chapel, facsimiles of various Grants and Indulgences to the Gild; with Representations of one hundred and fifty Public and Private Seals appended to them: facsimile extracts from the Register of the Gild, etc., London, Nichols and Son, 25, Parliament Square, 1836.

The Facsimiles are etchings colored by hand, and seem to have been carefully executed. An extract from the 'Address' to the book will explain its contents and reason for being.

"This work was originally intended to be confined to the representation and illustration of certain Paintings discovered on the walls of the Chapel in 1804. The first part was published in 1807. Soon after its publication, Mr. Fisher determined to re-visit Stratford, for the purpose of collecting whatever further information it might be found practicable to obtain there, relative either to the Chapel or its Paintings, or to their former proprietors, the ancient and once opulent and extensive Brotherhood of the Holy Cross.

It was then for the first time that he became acquainted with, and, through the kind interference of his friend John Card, Esq., was permitted to inspect, a considerable quantity of Records of high antiquity, which had belonged to the Gild, and were preserved among the documents of their successors, the Mayor and Corporation of Stratford, in a chest in the Gild Hall."

"The Records in question consisted of upwards of 600 Charters, comprehending grants of houses, lands, and various rents, with agreements, indentures, and some briefs or indulgences, extending, in a connected series, from before the reign of Henry the Third to that of Henry the Eighth; for the Gild accounts and rentals in an imperfect series during the same period; and in a large thick

volume, comprehending, in 176 folios, written in different hands, a Register of their proceedings from the fourth of Henry the Fourth till their dissolution, to which volume is prefixed the contributions and ordinances of the fraternity. . . ."

"To this labour [the exhibition of these Records] Mr. Fisher assiduously applied himself, and published besides sixteen plates of the Paintings, representations of one hundred and fifty ancient Seals, and twenty-six plates of Facsimiles of Records. To this he intended to have added, a Memoir of the Gild, and an Appendix of original documents, and a Description of the Chapel and Paintings. But, in consequence of the demand of copies, under the Copyright act, which required eleven copies out of one hundred and twenty (the number printed from the lithographic plates, before the drawings were destroyed) or nearly a tithe of the whole, Mr. Fisher suspended the finishing of this work, in the hope that the Legislature would see the necessity of repealing so iniquitous an Act. This tardy justice to literary men Mr. Fisher did not live to witness, though it has since been partially granted. It is, therefore, much to be regretted, that the present publication was left incomplete by its author."

Plate xiv in the book represents the mural painting of the assassination of Archbishop Becket, at the west end of the nave of the Chapel.

Plate xv an allegorical painting beneath that of the assassination of Becket.

Plate xvi "Verses at large on the above subject."

These verses are quite new to me, although they may be in some of the numerous collections of early English poetry. The stanzas as they appear in the plate have a different arrangement from the following. Following the scroll on which they are represented to be written they run as follows:

1	7
2	6
3	5

4

and (three lines).

Between the two sets of these (1, 2, 3; 7, 6, 5) there is an upright winged figure; below the last lines of 4, and at each end of the supplementary three lines, kneel two figures, over what may be a long chest, or "peyt" of the poem; within the "peyt" are seen a mortuary sack, much eaten by worms (painted a rich

madder by the colorist) and two skulls, with other bones.

In naming the poem it is best to use the words "Erth upon Erth." There is no internal connection between the poem and any particular event, such, for example, as the death of Becket, although, of course, it could be applied to that.

ERTH UPON ERTH.

- i. 1. Erth out of erth ys wondrously wrought
Erth hath gotyn uppon erth a dygnyte of noght
Erth ypon erth hath fett all hys thowht
How erth apon erth may be hey browght
- ii. 5. Erth vpon erth wold be a kyng
But how that erth gott to erth he thynkys noth-
yng
When erth byddys erth hys rentys whom bryng
Then schall erth apon erth have a hard ptyng:
- iii. Erth apon erth wynnys castellys and towrys
10. Then feth erth vnto erth thys ys all owrys
When erth apon erth hath bylde hys bowrys
Then schall erth for erth suffer many hard
schowrys.
- iv. Erth goth apon erth as man apon mowld
Lyke as erth apon erth neuer goo schold
15. Erth goth apon erth as gleferyng gold
And yet schall erth vnto erth rather then he
wold.
- v. Why that erth loueth erth wondur me thynke
Or why that erth wold for erth other swett or
swynke
When erth apon erth ys broght w^tyn the
brynke
20. Then schall erth apon erth have a fowll styne.
- vi. So erth on erth confedur thow may
How erth comyth to erth nakyd all way
Why schall erth apon erth goo stowte or gay
Seth erth out of erth schall paffe yn poor aray?
- vii. 25. I counfill erth apone erth that ys wondrously
wrogt
h t
The w yl 7 erth ys apon erth to torne hys
thowht
And pray to god vpon erth 7 all erth wroght
That all cryftin foullys to 7 blys may be broght
Whoo foo hym be thowght In wardly and ofte
How hard it is to flett
30. From bede to peyt From peyt to peyne that neu
schall feys ferten
s
He wold not doo no fyn all 7 world to win.

The verses will be seen to have some degree of merit aside from their antiquarian interest. The repetition of 'erth apon erth,' the loose lines of four accents, the rhymes *aaaa*, *bbbb*, etc., unite to produce an effect that is not soon forgotten. It would not be surprising if an echo of this old lyric were found in the literature of a time later than its own, and it is fair to assume that Shakespeare saw the lines: whether or not they appear in his works, in a changed or adapted form, remains to be seen.

The language calls for little comment. By the side of *hath*, *feth*, *comyth*, *goth*, *loueth*, etc., there appear *byddys*, *wynnys*. In the absence of facts regarding the date of the poem, old expressions such as 'swett or swynke,' 'man apon mowld' should not be overlooked. The poem is obviously very old and should not be omitted in a complete collection of M.E. lyrics.

The reading of lines 1-28 is quite clear; pting in l. 8 should be expanded: *per*ting; lines 29, 30 present a little difficulty. One hesitates at first to connect *flett* with M.E. *flitten*, *flütten*, as no vowel but *i(u)*, occurs in the examples given in Bradt.Strat. The double consonant *tt*, however, shows that the word is not to be confused with forms having *ē* < M.E. *fleotan*. The sense is further satisfied by *flitten*, *flütten*: . . . "how cruel it is to flit (that is, pass) from prayer to pit, (grave) from pit to pain (hell-pain) That never shall cease certain, He would," etc. These last three lines might be arranged in imperfect couplets of two accents each, but not much would be gained.

The arrangement of the poem which has been given might allow of discussion. Forgetting the scroll, and looking at the stanzas as they appear on the wall, it is natural at first to read them in the following order, 1, 2, 3, 7, 6, 5, 4. The conventional ending in 7, where some words from 1 are repeated (cf. also the rhymes) and the last line expressing the prayer that "all christian souls may be brought to bliss," indicate that this stanza should be the last. It certainly fits the end better than 4 which would fall there in any other arrangement. It is best, therefore, to follow the scroll in the order first given.

It would be interesting to know whether the mural paintings have ever received fuller and more scholarly treatment. If not, they would

make a subject for a valuable paper. The 'Assassination of Becket,' for example, represents the martyr in a position quite different from that in the accepted accounts. He is seen kneeling before the altar, upon which are the book and chalice. A large wound has been made over the right ear (he is in profile). He is beset by four men in mail, one of whom guards the door just behind the group. The only evidence of a previous encounter is the blood on the face of one of the men, who is planting the point of his sword in Becket's neck. At the farther end of the altar stands a monk, looking off, with right hand raised, possibly in benediction. The pillars which have always figured in the story are here reduced to the slimmest shafts, running to the vaulting above. Each of the four knights has his name written over him.

II.

One would hardly think of looking for verse in a suppressed volume of Parliamentary Records. In the collection of Scottish Records edited by Wm. Robertson and others and printed in 1804,¹ there are given on page 49, col. 1, eight lines of Scottish verse, preceded by three lines in Latin. A footnote merely says that

"the eleven preceding lines are in the heart of one of the pages of the manuscript and are written by the same hand that writes the rest of the original Volume i."

Unfortunately, these manuscripts were imperfectly described, and I do not remember to have seen the verse reproduced in the authoritative edition of the Scottish Acts.

The lines come between an Act of 1469 (10. Gac. iii) of the Parliament held at Edinburgh, and an Act of the same year but of another Session at the same place. It is more likely that they were introduced in the delay before the first entry of the second Session, than that they were added to the first, after the final entry was made. There is a familiar sound to the Scotch lines but lack of proper books makes identification or comparison impossible. The other lines may be left to a latinist.

Sede sens ista iudex inflexibilis sta
Sit tibi lucerna lex lux pellisque paterna
A manibus reuoces munus ab aure preces.

¹ v. J. H. U. Dissertation, 1893. 'A Study in the language of Scottish Prose.'

Prent in 7e patiens Blynd nocht thi conscience
Do thi God renerence thankand him ay
Dress 7e with diligence to put away negligence
Seiss 7e withe sufficiency This warld will away
Serf thi Gode meikle and 7e warlde bissyle
Eit 7i met merile sua may thou leif
Gif Gode sendis 7e pouerte Thank 7e him rechle
Ffor he may mende 7e sudanle and na man to greif.

The poem could be better arranged in two stanzas of eight lines each, the three rhyming lines of three accents followed by the tail-lines of two accents. In this form compare it with the four accent lines in Dunbar (Schipper, Poems i, no. 21.) with the tail-lines of two accents.

The poem in this arrangement² would suggest a date later than the statute in which it occurs, rather than earlier. As no year has been assigned to the MS. it may be that it is a later copy of the original statute (indeed the presence of the verse might be made to support this view) and thus the poem could be brought down to the time of Dunbar. The form, in Scotland at least, is certainly not common before his time.

W. P. REEVES.

Richmond, Ind.

OLD FRENCH GRAMMAR.

Grammatik des Altfranzösischen (Laut- und Formenlehre). VON EDUARD SCHWAN. Zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage. Leipzig: Reisland. 8vo, 247 pp. 1893.

THE task of the reviewer, which might have been one filled with pleasure, has now become

² Prent in 7e patiens,
Blynd nocht thi conscience,
Do thi Gode reuerence,
Thankand him ay;
Dress 7e with diligence
To put away negligence
Seiss 7e with sufficiency
This warld will away.

Serf thi Gode meikle
And 7e warlde bissyle
Eit 7i met merile
Sua may thou leif;
Gif Gode sendis 7e pouerte
Thank 7e him rechle
Ffor he may mende 7e sudanle
And na man to greif.

fraught with sorrow, and we approach our task with feelings of sadness, which it is difficult to contain. There is scarcely a book, whose appearance had been more eagerly awaited by workers in the field of Romanic Philology, than this second edition of Schwan's 'Old French Grammar,' and scarcely had its last line been written, when the hand that penned it is cold in death; a noble and promising career is suddenly cut short, and our feelings scarcely allow us to criticize where the fine old maxim 'de mortuis nil nisi bene' fills our heart. Some months ago, we had hoped that a new ventilation of certain questions, on which Dr. Schwan persisted to differ from commonly accepted opinions, and new objections offered, might have called forth new answers and more discussion, which might have brought us nearer to the truth. This object of our review has been denied us; but we know that we act in the spirit of our deceased colleague, if we do not refrain from serious criticism, and treat his book as the living work of a living scholar.

There can be no question that this second edition has been improved in many points. The atonic and subtonic* vowels are treated together, as they should be, and the verbs *être* and *avoir* are included among the strong verbs, an arrangement which was demanded by Neumann, *Z. f. r. Ph.* xiv, p. 580, but which is not without its inconveniences. But as far as the vowels are concerned, I should like to have found more grouping, treating all the tonic vowels together first when free, then when before a nasal, then when preceded or followed by palatals, and so forth. The development of the different vowels in these cases is so similar, that the similarity should be emphasized, and all who have had experience in teaching this subject to beginners, will agree that great confusion might in this manner be easily avoided. A similar method of treatment (as for example in Meyer-Lübke's 'Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen')

*I translate the German *neben-tonig* by 'subtonic' which is to mean 'somewhat tonic' as 'suboval'—'somewhat oval.' I have also for some years past been using 'checked' as a translation of the German *gedeckt*; French *entravé*. Those familiar with the history of checked vowels in French, will agree that the term is accurate.

should be extended to the consonants as well, and I cannot believe at all that the Grammar would thereby have lost as a book of reference, as the author suggests in the preface; quite on the contrary, by being more systematic, it would also have become more easy of reference.

A most valuable addition are seven pages of bibliographical notes, which will be thankfully received by all those who use the Grammar. That in such a list no reference should be found to articles published in this country, is so much in harmony with the usual state of affairs, that it calls for no further comment.

In the following remarks, I have collected a number of points that seemed of interest, while comparing this second with the first edition. In many instances the criticism raised by Neumann, *Z. f. r. Ph.* xiv, pp. 543-584 in his review of the first edition, have not received the hearing, which they deserved, and that admirable and suggestive critique is, therefore, as important for this edition as for the former. A special review of the second edition by Meyer-Lübke appeared in *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Lit.* xv, pp. 85-96.

A number of typographical errors need correction.—§58. For 491,2 read 471,3, and not 472,3 as it is wrongly corrected on p. 209.—§74. For *ai* read *āi*.—§86. For *ei* read *ēi*.—§97. Read 12,2, c for §9,2 c.—§101. Change *oi* to *ōi*, cf. §305; the same mistake occurs §107, and §134.—§108 read §12,2 d.—§177, Anm. for §175, 2 read §169.—§183, l. 5 change 'Anlaut' to 'Auslaut'; it is curious that this slip should have been allowed to pass unnoticed through two editions.—§212; change §41, b. 3 to §47, b. 3.—§226, Anm. l. 7 read *piliare* for *piliar*.—§259, change (*l*) to (*l̃*).—§320-4; change 238,3 to 239,3.—§399-4, l. 4; correct Nr. 5 to §400,5.—§402-3, l. 4 change *cilz* to *cels*.—§403, paradigm; **ekkēstēi* is wrongly accented.—§411; for *elloru* read *ellōru*.—§411-2; change *pechez* to *pechiez*.—§425, 2; for 435,2 read 434,2.—§429, 2; change §463 to §464.—§459, 2; for *cadēre* read *cadēre*.—§465; correct 'Ichoativformen' to 'Inchoativformen'.—§472; change *missi* to *misi*.

§11. In the first edition it was stated that quality alone was the determining factor in the history of O. Fr. vowel changes. Upon a

vigorous protest from Neumann, l. c. p. 544, the paragraph has been remodeled, but as it seems to me in an awkward manner. It is now clothed in one of those unhappy mannerisms of scientific parlance, which, when reduced to its lowest terms, shows that Schwan had not changed his opinion with regard to the question of quality and quantity.

§12-c. Strike out *dobitare*, which has no accented *o*.

§13. It would be best to strike out *nuptia* from this list, for there are at least two words, *ndvius* and *ndctem*, whose meaning might have exercised the influence which changed *nūptia* to *noptia*.

§16. Insert *m* (l. 5) between *p* and *d*, and, as examples, add *calamum* > *calmu*, *eremum* > *ermu*.

§23-3. For *gāvjola* read *gavjōla*. This mistake is a natural consequence of Schwan's wrong point of view with regard to the change of accent in *idlus* > *īdlus*, §19-4; cf. Neumann, l. c. p. 547.

§25. The paragraph would become much clearer for beginners, if 'labialen' (l. 2) were changed to 'labiolabialen.'

§40. The 1. pers. plur. of *fui* is here given as *ſomus*, whereas §534 we find *ſōimus*.

§42. The change of the ending *-ūdinem* > *-ūminem* is still treated in a paragraph headed 'Suffixvertauschung'; but Cohn, 'Suffixwandlungen,' pp. 264 ff., has shown that here we do not have to do with a change of suffix, but merely with the reshaping of a classical ending upon the model of a more common popular sequence of consonants.

§53. For the position of the secondary accent, it seems to me the law as stated by Meyer-Lübke, *Z. frz. Spr. u. Lit.* xv, p. 88, is much more reasonable; namely: 'Wörter mit drei und mehr Silben vor der betonten haben den Nebenaccent auf der ersten Silbe.' As far as the impossible accentuation *demēndāre*, etc., is concerned, cf. Neumann, l. c. p. 550.

§56-2. From this paragraph, as well as many others, it appears, that we still need a scientific exposition of just what constitutes a check in French phonology, and what are its results. Schwan sees a check wherever the tonic vowel had not changed its quality in O. Fr. (as in *pa-cem*), and through this arbitrary

assumption he is lead into serious inconsistency, so *prēcat* (§92) has free *ε* but *cacat* §80 has checked *a*. I doubt whether *ī* after *a*, *ε*, *o* constituted a check. In certain dialects the *i* before *ī* was pronounced; cf. my article on 'Dialectische Eigenthümlichkeiten in der Entwicklung des mouillierten *l* im Altfranzösischen,' *Publ. Mod. Lang. Asso.* v, pp. 52 ff. Rol. 78 *cunseill* stands in *ēi* assonance, and in the Champagne dialect (which is so closely related to that of Isle de France) we find *consoil*. The presumption is a strong one, that it may also have been pronounced in case of the other vowels, but that at an early time it was again absorbed by the *ī*. The nature of the tonic vowel was, therefore, sufficiently changed to prevent its participation in the development which free tonic vowels underwent in general. To be sure the development of the vowel is checked, but to say that *a*, *ε*, *o* + *ī* are checked in the way that *a* is in *charle*, and to separate *a*, *ε*, *o* + *ī* from *ε* and *o* + *ī* in my opinion distorts the correct view of the history of these sounds.

§57-2. The change of *ε* > in *buvoins* is here attributed to the influence of the preceding labial only (cf. *berluea* > *berlue*, *betumen* > *beton*), but correctly to the surrounding labials in §510-1.

§60. For *noël* it is not necessary to posit an hypothetical **notalen*, as has been conclusively shown by Todd, *MOD. LANG. NOTES* vi, col. 169. At the same time it is interesting to note that the regular form *nael* was used quite late; cf. *nael deu* = *natalis dei*, 'Brandan' 846, but *noel* 1308, *ibid.*

§60-2. Why *medisme* 'für zu erwartendes **midesme*'? The regular O. Fr. form is *medesme*: *medisme* shows a change of suffix, cf. Meyer-Lübke, 'Rom. Gram.' i, p. 120. The same erroneous view prevails in §412.

§72-2. Anm. explains *aiant* correctly as 'Neubildung,' whereas §247-3 Anm. this same form is used to substantiate the law that *bī* becomes *i*. This latter point, to be sure, is corrected in the 'Nachträge und Berichtigungen,' p. 210, but, then, the whole theory of Schwan in §247 remains without basis.

§75, Anm. 1. Add *alid* > *al* and *el*, not **alu* as in §79, Anm.

§76. If *ajdjier* is to denote *ad'ier*, the or-

thography is admissible, otherwise it means nothing.—No provision is made for such words as *baca*, *macula*, *battalia*. To say, as Schwan does, that *a* in this words is checked, because it does not change to *e*, is merely a makeshift; cf. the remarks to §56-2. The *e* is certainly free in *precas*, and I can see no difference between this and *pacas*. The difference between *cattum* > *chat* and *cacat* > *chie* also proves conclusively that in the latter case *a* is free.

§79-2. *Pacem*, *tacet*, *placet*, *Cameraci* do not belong here. Schwan allows himself to be misled by his phonetic transcriptions. In their place supply *factum* > *fait*, *magis* > *mais*, *facimus* > *faimes*. The reason why *a* in *pacem* did not become *e*, is stated by Neumann, l. c. p. 551. Against the equation *Cameraci* > *Chambrai* (cf. also, §80-2 and §194-3) militates also the development of *-ci* in *feci* > *fi*, for which we have no right to posit an intermediate form **fi*, as is done in §476. The separation of *-ce(m)* from *-ci*, upon which Schwan still insists, is shown to be without foundation by the similarity of development which characterizes these two sounds in all other positions.

§80. Strike out 'und *j*,' because no examples in point exist in the language. *Jacet* is not checked any more than *calet* > *chiell*, or *paret* > *pert*.

§88. Read *debila*. In the French forms the accented vowel sometimes bears the closed mark, sometimes not, an irregularity which may also be observed in other paragraphs. Instead of *mirabilia* it is best to posit *miribilia* under the influence of *mirificus*. The suffix *-ece* is to be derived with Mussafia, *Rom.* xviii, p. 533, from *-acia*. In **miribilia* and *vigilia* the tonic vowel is not checked.

§89. The paragraph is to teach that *ε*+nasal+cons. becomes *ɛ̃*, and still all the French examples with the exception of the last, which is not marked at all, show *ε*.

§91-2. The *l* in *mielz* and *mieldre* is not palatal, and the diphthong does not regularly belong here, because of the check. I believe that it was introduced from *vielz*, and the *tertium comparationis* were the unaccented syllables in *veillard*, *veillece* and *meillor*; cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES v, p. 52. For *pedicum* (better than *pedica*), *lepidum* and that whole

class of words the diphthongisation took place before the vowel of the penult was syncopated. *Kj* in line 4 is a most unhappy abbreviation, especially in a paragraph as the present.

§93-Anm. The Isle de France dialect knows *-iaus* as well as *-eaus*.

§94. It is stated correctly here that *ε*+*n*+cons. becomes *ɛ̃* (*ɛ̃*) and later *a*, but the same remark should be made in §89 for *ε*+*n*+cons.

§98. We are told that 'in den ältesten französischen Denkmälern wie Alexius, Rolandslied und Karls Reise' *φ*+oral consonant remains *o* and becomes later *u* (*ou*). To say nothing of the unique use of the expression 'oldest French monuments' the statement is wrong for 'Rol.' and 'Charl.' The statement that *eu* in the written language has been introduced from the northern dialects, is incorrect. The Isle de France dialect followed the same line of change (*φ* > *oo* > *ow* > *ou* > *eu*) as the Picard for instance.

§99. Strike out *ornat* > *orne*, since *o* here never become *ou*. The closed quality of the *φ* is not marked in *dormitorju*.

§100. It should be stated here that *φ* becomes *ɔ̃* when it was nasalized. Here also *o* is sometimes marked *φ*, sometimes the mark is omitted.

§100-2. The rule is stated here as though the disappearance of the nasality took place after the gemination of the *m* or *n*; the first edition contained the same rule, which was then criticized by Neumann, l. c. p. 555; cf. also G. Paris, *Rom.* x, p. 53. A correct conception is very important here, because beginners are apt to attribute the geminated consonant (as in *nomme* for instance) to the assimilation of *m*+*n*.

§102. Beginners, whose ideas of phonetic development and accentuation are confused and vague, need to be told that *uo* becomes *yé* through *ue* > *uê*.

§103. It should be pointed out that in *noctem* > *nuit* *ð* could not diphthongize before *ct* had become *it*, and the check had been removed.

§104. We still find *fou*, *lou*, *jou* marked with a closed *o*, to which Neumann so strenuously objected, l. c. p. 555. That *leu* is to be explained through *lou*, with change of *ou* > *eu* (as in *douleur*) is doubtful, for it is found long

before this development took place and in dialects that never knew it; cf. *leu*, *liu* in Alexis. My own view as to the development of *locum* > *lieu* I have given in MOD. LANG. NOTES vii, p. 65 ff.

§106-2. Strike out 'und doppeltem Nasal' and change the rest of the paragraph to 'weshalb der darauf folgende Nasal verdoppelt wurde'; cf. also the remarks to §100-2.

§113. The tonic vowel is sometimes marked closed, sometimes not.

§119. It should be stated that *acutum* appears as *eu* regularly only in proper names; cf. *Monthen*. For the rest of the paragraph Neumann's objections, l. c. p. 556, remain still valid.

§121-2. The O. Fr. form of *chevreuil* is *chevrueil*, *chevroel*, (cf. 'Charl.' *chevroels*). The ending, *-euil* is analogical to words like *deuil*, *seuil*, etc.; cf. Darmestetter and Hatzfeld, 'Dict.' s. v. As in so many other cases, the word is lacking in Godefroy, and the earliest citation of *chevreuil* in Darmest. and Hatzf. is from Rabelais.

§122-2. *Annel* is apt to convey the idea that Lat. *nn* is preserved in Mod. Fr. *anneau*. The regular O. Fr. form is *anel*; cf. also §245.

§123. Meyer-Lübke, l. c. has already emphasized the fact that there is no criterion by which it can be decided, whether the pretonic vowels (as in *fermare*) were closed or open. *Demàndâre* is an impossible accentuation; so also *acûtjâre* §144, and many other examples throughout the book.

§141. The falsity of *abwobjare* (which Schwan does not even mark with a star) has been pointed out by Meyer-Lübke, l. c. p. 90.

§142. Schwan seems to have considered it doubtful, whether Frankish **haunjan* had become *hûnir*; but how is *nn* to be explained, if the stem vowel was not nasalized?

§146. In the chapter on posttonic vowels, much greater clearness would have been gained if the atonic vowels after the subtonic accent had been separated from those after the tonic accent. The principle, so clearly developed by Darmestetter, *Rom.*, v, pp. 140ff., that the tonic accent divides the word into two halves, which are treated alike with regard to their atonic vowels, is so fundamental as well as helpful to beginners, that the omission of a clear statement of it is a serious loss.

§149-2. *Jqv(e)ne* is here given as *jone*, §170 as *juene*.

§150. The combinations *l'p* (*colp* < *colaphus*) and *l'g* (*cueil* < *colligo*) are still wanting.

§151. Strike out *guadju* > *gage*, which is correctly explained as a verbal noun in §249, Anm.

§152. With regard to *donrai*, I prefer Neumann's explanation, that the form is analogical to futures like *vendrai*, and *merveille* and *sairement* should be kept distinct; cf. Neumann, l. c. p. 558.

§156. The symbol *z* which occurs again in §192, evidently means 'mouilliertes z,' but no provision is made for it on p. 244.

§160-3. It is doubtful whether *v* in *solv're* (> *soldre*) could change to *d* by any process of assimilation to surrounding sounds. The phonetic conditions in cases like *carc're* > *chartre* which Schwan evidently has in mind, are altogether different. In admitting that *v* here might have been assimilated to the following *r*, Schwan is curiously inconsistent with his §230. It seems to me that the explanation is to be seen in the fact that *v* between *l* and *r* falls, because its labiodental articulation is incompatible with the tongue articulations that precede and follow, and then an epenthetical *d* springs up between *l* and *r*.

§162-Anm. 1. After 'Worte' (l. 6) insert 'mit ähnlicher Bedeutung.'

§166. Cf. Neumann's remarks, l. c. p. 558-559.

§172-Anm. It is not necessary to assume that *carpinu* become *carminu*; *carp'nu* could easily become *carm'nu* > *charme*, by simple assimilation.

§175. What is the meaning of the dot under the *a* in *vetare*?

§175-2-Anm. Not all the words with final *f*=Latin dental are learned. Schuchardt's explanation of *soif* on the analogy of *jo boif* seems to me very satisfactory.

§182-2. If all combinations of more than two consonants had been treated together, a great deal of unnecessary scattering would have been avoided.

§182-3. In view of the development of *situla* > *seille*, which is popular, it should be stated, that the words in question represent a later period of adoption into the language.

§191. Correct *digitu* > *dejidu* > *deid* > *deit* >

doit, and so also *dejitu* in l. 5 should be changed to *dejidu*; cf. however *deg(i)tu* in §88-2.

§194. From this paragraph it appears that Schwan evidently had not been convinced that a difference existed in O. Fr. between *pacem* > *pais*, *decem* > *dis* and *nucem* > *noiz*, *vocem* > *voiz*, *picem* > *peiz*; cf. Mussafia, *Rom.* xviii, p. 548.

§194-3. Cf. the remarks to §79-2.

§196-2. Instead of *colkinu* > *coussin*, Jenkins in MOD. LANG. NOTES viii, p. 151, has brought forward some strong reasons for deriving the French form from **culticinum*.

§201. Place *wtoricare* > *otreier* > *otroier* before 'wenn das nachtonige e gehalten wurde.' In the 'Anmerkung' we meet again with Schwan's often combatted idea that the suffix *-uca* (-*uga*) was changed to *-uta* (-*uda*). That this opinion is erroneous appears from Prov. *charruio*, *ruio*, cf. Sabersky, 'Das parasitische i im Alt- und Neuprovenzalischen,' p. 15. *Manjues*, *manjue* are discarded as not capable of proving the commonly accepted law that *-uca* > *-ue*, because they do not 'streng lautlich den lateinischen Formen entsprechen.' The logic in this reasoning is not easily seen, for *manjues* evidently stands for *mandues*, with merely the stem changed to suit the ending accented forms, and nothing more; cf. *manduja*, Sabersky, l. c.

§215. *Antiquus* is here said to become regularly *antif*, while in §317 Anm., the same *antif* is said to be analogical to the feminine.

§217. This paragraph does not differ seriously from the similar paragraph in the first edition. Neumann's objections, l. c. p. 564 have been made use of, but merely by putting all the words adduced by him into a note, and calling them learned.

§219. The *i* in words like *pareil* is said to be merely graphic, and that it was pronounced only in the Eastern dialects. But what about *-eil(le)* in *ei* assonance, 'Rol.' 78, 985, 2750 and 3761?—Anm. 2 read §206-1-Anm. for §205-1-Anm.

§229. *Pueble* is a popular form; *pueple* is meant.

§230-5. For the objections to the change of *potu're* > *poldre*, cf. the remarks to §222.

§232 In l. 5 strike out the first *t*. The or-

thography *tz* for *l̃+s* is explained 'indem j zwischen l und s zu t wird'! A still more emphatically erroneous view with regard to the nature of *l̃* is found §328. Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES vii, p. 148.

§237. As far as the gemination of *m* or *n* after *o* is concerned, cf. the remarks to §100-2 and 106-2. The change of *n* > *l* in *orfelin* I would like to attribute not so much to a desire to differentiate the 'Silbenanlaut' as to the fact that *orfelin* seemed much more of a diminutive to *orfe* than *orfenin*.

§247. The objections to a twofold development of *bj* and *vj* have been stated so often, that it is unnecessary to repeat them here. With the suppression of *aiant*, according to §72-2 Anm. little remains that could be construed into an argument for Schwan's point of view.

§248-Anm. For the derivation *pigeon* from *pidionem* for *pipionem* cf. G. Paris, *Rom.* xviii, p. 587.

§250. *Exliquidjare* for O. Fr. *esligier* is a new etymology which had also appeared in the first edition, and should at least be marked with a star.—The word is of Germanic origin, cf. Körting s. v.

§253. *Noptiae* with *o* is in contradiction to §13.—For the change of *o* > *ø* cf. our remarks above.

§259-2. Cf. the remarks to §232.

§283. That *oi* < *ei* was a falling diphthong is proved by its further change to *oe*; cf. Rossmann, 'Französisches oi,' p. 24. The same criticism applies to §285-2 and Anm.

§290. The vocalization of *l* > *u* is here said to date from the first half of the xi. century; §231 from the middle of the xi. century.

§292. For *fou*, *jou* instead of *fou*, *jou* cf. the remarks to §104.

§300. The nasal vowel, which developed from Lat. *o* is wrongly marked *ø*.

§315. *Potèstativum* is an extremely unlikely accentuation; cf. the remarks to §53.

§325. Is *nagier* < **naticare* to mean *reculer*? cf. Godefroy, s. v.; if not, the etymology is wrong; *nagier* (to swim) derives regularly from *navigare*.

§328-2. Cf. the remarks to §232.

§333. Cf. Neumann's remarks, l. c. p. 572 to §330.

§341-2. The change from *pūtida* of the first edition to *pūtta* is not to be commended.

§364-3. L. 4. 'Die ersten Formen dieser Art finden sich schon seit Ende des xii. Jahrh.' agrees badly with '*grande* schon Alexius 60' in Anm. 1. below. In Anm. 2. we find *negrus*, *entegrus* to explain *neirs* and *entirs*. These forms were introduced to meet Neumann's objection, l. c. p. 573 to §360. It would seem, however, that these nom. sing. can easily be explained from the acc. *negru* > *neir*, *entegru* > *entir* and that, therefore, it is not necessary to have recourse to these constructed forms.

§378-2. For (*ferme*) read (*ferma*).

§370. *Frailes* < *fragilis* is learned; *gl* would have given *ī*. The final *e* can, therefore, not be looked upon as a supporting vowel; cf. also §375.

§381. What objection is there to deriving *joindre* from *jūnior* or *jonior*, with tonic vowel changed under the influence of *jūvenis*; so Neumann explains the word, l. c. p. 574. *Jōvenjor* would not have lost its labial element without trace.

§393. What is the meaning of *ēllī* and *ēk-ēllī*?

§395. It is stated that O. Fr. *ieu* (= *ego*) corresponding to *diēu* as far as the diphthongization of the tonic vowel is concerned, does not exist. But if this is so, how are *jeo*, *jeu* (Bartsch-Horning, 'Chrest.' 274-34 and 109-29) to be explained?

§396. I cannot understand the need of the short quantity mark in *mē*, *lē*, *sē*, *nōs*, *vōs*. The Latin vowels of course were long, and the French forms show the regular development of *ē* and *ō* in unaccented position.

§398. The tonic vowel in *ēllēi* needs to have its open quality marked much more than the atonic *ē*; both *illui* and *illaei*, moreover, should be marked with stars. In §398-3 l. 5 *ēllēi* is correctly marked, but it is wrong again in the 'Anmerkung.'

§399. In the paradigm *ēllī* conflicts with the correct *ēllī* (*illi*) below. The quantity of the tonic vowel is wrong in *ēllōrē*, (cf. *ēllōru* §411) and why is the initial vowel marked short in the Latin atonic forms (§399) and closed in the tonic forms (§398)?

§400. In the paradigm *ēllī*, n. pl. should be *ēllī*.

§400-1. I cannot believe that the article in the n. s. became *li* 'durch Angleichung an die Pluralform.' Had such a consciousness existed, it seems to me the language would rather have differentiated these two forms. The explanation seems to me to lie in the fact that *le*+cons. become regularly *le*, while *le*+vowel become *li*. Now we have a nom. article, sing. *le* and *li*, plur. *li*. The influences of the majority of forms then causes the nom. article to become *li*.

§403. Note the wrong accentuation in **ek-kēstēi*.

§428. In §426-Anm. 1. *somes*, and Anm. 2 *esmes* are explained as analogical to *faimes*. This association may have been felt, but *esmes* is easily explained from **esmus* built upon the model of *estis*, and this *esmes* again prevented *estis* from becoming **ests* > **ez*. This explanation is given, though not in the clearest possible manner §426, Anm. 2, but in §428 *esmes*, *somes* and *estes* are all referred again directly to the influence of *faimes*, *faites*, *dimes dites*.

§433. O. Fr. *doing* (= *dono*) is explained as due to a fusion of an hypothetical **doi* (formed upon the model of *ai*) with *don* (> *dono*). But this fusion would not explain the palatal *n*. Why is not *doing* to be looked upon as an indicative to the pres. subj. *doigne*, and this again as analogical to *preigne* (*prendre*); *doing*: *preing* as *doigne*: *preigne*, as to give: to take.

§433-4. The later forms of the 1. pers. sing. *criens*, *mains*, *plains* do not receive their *s* from *doins*, as is stated here, but they take on the same ending as *rends*, which is the *s* of *facio* > *fas* (*fais*). The explanation of this ending in general for the verbs of the 2. and 3. conjugation is altogether lacking; the same wrong explanation occurs once more §492.

§437. *Dixisti* should have given *deissis* or *dissis* (cf. §218) but not *dessis*.

§455. The regular development of *neccem* is **nis* not **niz*; cf. *decem* > *dis*.

§446-2. Cf. the remarks to §201, Anm. 1. *Manjues* with regard to its tonic vowel is quite regular, and it is not necessary to suppose such a strained analogy as that of *ajude*.

§447-2. Change *rendēit* to *rendēit*. The existence of *rendēsti*, *rendēmus*, *rendēstis* is not at all proven; *rendēsti* (< *rendēdisti*) be-

comes *rendis(t)* by umlaut, and from this person the *i* is carried first into the second pers. plur. and then into the first pers. plur. 'Späteres *perdiest*' (l. 10) is misleading, because it is analogical and rare; the regular development requires *e*, as in *perdesse*, 'Eul.' 17.

§449. In spite of Neumann's remark, l. c. p. 583, the ending of the 1. and 2. pers. plur. pres. subj. are still given as *-iens*, and *-iez*; cf. also §454 and §461.

§456. The ending *-ie* in the imperf. ind. of the first conjugation is due not merely to the analogy of the auxiliary *avoir* (*aveie*), but rather to the influence of all the other verbs whose imperfect ended in popular Latin *-lam*.

§451-2. *Chanté(t)* is again given as 3. pers. sing. of the preterit=Lat. *cantāv(i)t*.

§452. The trigraph *jtj* (cf. *jdj* §76), is not mentioned in §217 where it would have belonged. It is to be presumed that it stands for *t'*, but then the mode of representation is not strictly phonetic; *jt'* or *jt'* (and so also *jd'*) would have sufficed.

§463. Cf. *partimimus* in the paradigm, but *cantavimus* §451. In §428 the possibility is granted that *-imes* and *ames* may have developed from *-ivimus*, *-avimus*, and in §39 are given *amamus*, *partimus*, and the paragraph ends with the sentence 'Alle diese Formen (of §39) finden sich belegt.'

§465-3. *Soffrir* does not belong in a list of inchoative presents.

§471-3. Schwan here allows Umlaut for the strong perfects in the 2. pers. sing; *-esti>is(t)*, which inconsistently enough he did not admit in the case of the *-dēdi* perfects of the second class of weak verbs. In his explanation of the vowel in the 1. and 2. pers. plur. (*-imes*, *-istes*), Schwan limits the analogical influence to the perfects of the 2. and 3. class of the secondary verbs. The analogy, I think, is wider; it is due to a consciousness in the language that the 2. pers. sing. and the 1. and 2. pers. plur. should have the same vowel. Criticism of a similar nature has to be passed on another instances of the workings of analogy, as Schwan formulates the influence; cf. §456.

§476. Latin *feci* becomes *fis* (or **fiz*) regularly, not **fi*. This form is posited by Schwan

merely to substantiate his views with regard to the development of words like *Chambrai*; cf. §79-2. *Fecit* (§486-2) should have become **feist*, not **feit*. The original conjugation must have been 1. *fis* (*fiz*), 3. *feist*, 6. *firent*, and 2. *feisis*, 4. *feisimes*, 5. *feisistes*. This is changed to *fis*, *feisis*, *fist*, *feisimes*, *feisistes*, *firent* and then 2, 4 and 5 becomes *sesis*, *sesimes*, *sesistes*, when the whole tense goes over to the second class of strong perfects.

§486. The explanation of the history of *ducere* is misrepresented, because of the author's erroneous view with regard to the development of *-uco*, *-uca*; cf. §201.

§492-2. Only the 3. pers. sing. and plur. of *volui* as *-ui* perfect are said to have remained, while §499 also gives the 1. pers. sing. *vōlui>voil*.

§498. The perfect of *debēre* is similar to *fui* only after *ēu* had been contracted to *u*; hence it is inaccurate to say that *dēus*, *dēumes*, *dēustes* are analogical to the same persons of *fui*. The second division of this paragraph is quite new. He posits for French proper *awis*, *awimes*, *awistes*, which become in analogy to *fui*, and with the stem vowel of the strong forms *ōus*, *ōumes*, *ōustes*. At the same time it is impossible to decide, whether the author believes that *awis* became **awus*, and then *ōus*, or whether the two changes, which he supposes, took place simultaneously. Suchier would scarcely recognize his study in *Z.f.r.Ph.* ii, in this new dress.

§504-5. If *avrai* shows the regular development of *v+r*, how is *saurai* to be explained? Analogy to *aurai* (as is supposed §507-) is out of the question. Cf. Neumann, l. c. p. 558.

§511. O. Fr. *recoif* derives from **recepō*, not *recepio*, and is regular.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Leland Stanford Jr. Univ.

GERMAN HUMANISM.

Albrecht von Eyb und die Frühzeit des deutschen Humanismus, von Dr. MAX HERRMANN. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1893. 8vo, pp. vii, 437.

In the issue of May, 1893, of this journal, we reviewed the first two volumes of Mr. Herrmann's work on Albrecht von Eyb, containing

Albrecht's German writings, and it was with a certain curiosity, but not without some skepticism that we took up the third and last volume, containing Albrecht's life. Would the author furnish the promised proofs of his assertions and solve the questions that arose in the preceding volumes? We are glad to state that Mr. Herrmann has indeed redeemed his pledges, and has fully vindicated for his hero the position due to him as *the first German humanist, preceding even Niklas von Wyle*. We may, however, add at once that we cannot consider it proved that the latter made an important, and unacknowledged, loan, for his 'Translationes' from one of Eyb's original Latin works.

A rare combination of thorough methodical research and extraordinary good luck, has enabled the author to give us such detailed information about Albrecht's life and works as we hardly possess about any German writer before 1500.

In the modest family mansion of Schloss Sommersdorf in Franconia, Albrecht von Eyb was born on the 24th of August, 1420. His mother Margarete gave the boy the first instruction, and it is in honor of this first teacher that Albrecht's most important Latin work is named 'Margarita poetica.' From Erfurt, where he had gone to continue his studies, he is called home by the news of his father's death; his brother Ludwig, now the head of the family, sends him to attend school at Rotenburg and, afterwards, again at Erfurt. Ludwig's learned cousin, Johannes von Eyb, whom Albrecht highly praises both as his teacher and his friend, and who himself had pursued his legal studies in Italy, probably exerted his influence to have the young man sent to that country, then the fountain-head of all science and learning. In 1444, Albrecht left Germany, and during a sixteen years' stay at the Italian universities, became thoroughly imbued with humanistic ideas in regard to form as well as to thought. From Pavia he went to Bologna, and thence, to escape the plague, to Padua. We learn about his teachers both in the legal and in the philosophical faculty, among them, first of all, Balthasar Rasinus, with whom he was later to read Plautus. In Bamberg, where he was

obliged to go and stay a year (1452), we find him occupied with literary work. "Another Ovid," to use Mr. Herrmann's lucky comparison, he takes pen in hand to console himself, and in these short essays of the year 1452, we have the earliest examples of humanistic writings by a German on German soil. As soon as he has acquired his Bamberg canonry, he hastens back to Italy, where we can trace him at Bologna and Pavia. In the former city, he meets with a number of Germans who were to form the van-guard of humanism in their Cimmerian country, and it certainly bespeaks Eyb's high estimation among his country-men that they conferred upon him the high honor of 'procurator almanorum nationis' for the year 1453. That Eyb did not give all his time and thought to his studies is shown by a collection of loose songs, some of them more than spicy, which he wrote in his Tibullus manuscript; we may mention that his first literary production in Germany treats of a similar subject: 'de speciositate Barbare puelle.' He also experiences the trials and tribulations characteristic of student life: his money will never go as far as his economical guardian and brother Ludwig expects, and the student has even to resort to the threat of leaving the clerical orders in order to wrest two hundred florins from the close hands of Ludwig, who, it appears, had never been a student.

In Pavia, he finishes his studies and takes the degree of Doctor of Laws. Not only to professional studies, however, were these last four or five years given, but also to the liberal arts: in Pavia he read Plautus with Balthasar Rasinus, a study which was to be very fruitful for his literary work.

As a mature man of nearly forty years, Eyb returns to Germany and not with empty hands, for the 'Margarita poetica' was finished in the spring of 1459; probably it was not only conceived, but also composed, in Italy. But the work was written for Germany, where complete texts of classic authors were as yet very rare and where, therefore, such an anthology was much needed. Eyb's work was to be a repertory of the classic art both of writing and of living, for it is the moral aspect as much as the literary that he emphasizes. How proud

Albrecht himself was of his book is shown by the hexameter of his own hand at the end of the manuscript,

Gloria Alberti nullum moritura per eum, 1459,

and though we cannot help smiling at the enthusiastic self-admiration that inspired the author to this his only ride on the classic Pegasus, it is nevertheless true that the work was very valuable and was greatly appreciated by the public. This appears from the fact that it is one of the few books of the time that were printed, and no less than fifteen editions of it are known to have been issued within thirty-two years (1472-1503).

The first months in Germany seemed to augur the peaceful life of a scholar, such as had been the dream of Ulrich von Hutten before events, stronger than himself, called him into the arena of public life and struggle. We have three treatises about marriage and woman, the last of Eyb's humanistic work in Latin, which he finished between the 24th of November, 1459 and the 8th of January, 1460.

During the succeeding ten years, we can find no trace of literary occupation: this entire period seems to have been spent in the wild scramble for dignities and benefices. One can hardly imagine a more picturesque chapter, one more descriptive of the general distress at the end of the middle ages, than that which describes the history of Albrecht's efforts to get possession of his Würzburg archdeaconry, involving as it did, two journeys across the Alps to the Apostolic see, captivity, release for a heavy ransom, and final installation, after the whole apparatus of temporal and spiritual power had been set in motion.

In the seventies, a "feverish activity"—as Mr. Herrmann calls it with some exaggeration—follows this stagnation: the 'Ehebüchlein' was dedicated to the Imperial City of Nuremberg on January 1, 1472, the 'Spiegel der Sitten' was "angefangen, gemittelt vnd geendet" in May, 1474.

There is a remarkable contrast between Albrecht's Latin and his German writings. The former are simply a mosaic, culled with minutest care from the classic authors; in the latter we discover a vigor and conciseness of style for which Mr. Herrmann fails to give any explanation. The brilliant qualities of Albrecht's

German works, which stand out in bold relief against his humanistic prolixity and lack of method elsewhere, seem to allow of only one explanation. Albrecht is but another Antaeus gathering strength from the touch with the native soil; it is his mother-language that endows him with qualities which were refused him in his Latin efforts, and which give color and life to his German books.

On the 24th of July, 1475, Albrecht von Eyb passed away, and though his works were printed again and again, posterity very soon forgot the author's name and fate. But this ungratefulness is quite pardonable, for his best work was not published until 1511, nearly forty years after it was written, and then it appeared with a crowd of other translations, whilst in 1474, it would have been the only one besides that of Boëthius. In 1511, Humanism had conquered the countries north of the Alps, not, however, to find the ground ready for a purely literary development, but to serve only as a powerful weapon in the struggle with the highest questions left unsolved by the middle ages. As far as Humanism did develop by itself, it became philology and was, therefore, too exclusive to have any sympathy with the attempts at popularization, made by its precursors.

Much praise is due to Mr. Herrmann for his book, expounding, as it does, his hero's life and works. Nowhere is his information meager, nowhere is he satisfied with offering bare facts. His object is to give a vivid picture of the period and of all the relations in which Albrecht stood with its various interests. We learn about his brother Ludwig, who played an important part not only in Albrecht's life, but also in the political history of his time; we learn, too, about Balthasar Rasinus, the Plautus interpreter at Pavia, about the German element in the legal faculty of Bologna from 1433-1459, especially about Eyb's "commilitones" there in 1453, about the men that made up the chapter of Eichstädt, where he seems to have spent most of his life after returning from Italy. Exhaustiveness is Mr. Herrmann's ambition, and although in a few of his excursus he seems to overshoot the mark, his method on the whole serves to enliven and give color, to his subject,

which, it must be remembered, is not only the life and works of Albrecht, but the beginnings of German humanism in general. We cannot dwell upon those parts of the book in which Mr. Herrmann traces Albrecht's method of composition in Latin and German, and in which a number of critical questions are successfully solved; in our judgment, these parts are very good.

As we have already hinted, we find some fault with Mr. Herrmann's idea of thoroughness. A digression about rhetoric as a school discipline, beginning with 'Ad Herennium,' and another about the institution of marriage, beginning with the Jewish ideas with regard to it, are hardly indispensable to a true appreciation of the 'Ehebüchlein' and the 'Spiegel der Sitten.' Would not some more detailed statement of Albrecht's principles of translating have done more good, at least toward firmly establishing his prominent place among the early German prose-writers?

Finally, we want to speak at some length of the fourth chapter ('Residence at Bamberg,' 1452), which offers occasion for criticism. That Mr. Herrmann should be somewhat inclined to overestimate the value of Albrecht is only natural; but we cannot be expected to follow him in this, nor to accept as proved what, at best, seems but probable to the unprejudiced mind. As to the first two treatises, 'de speciositate Barbare puellæ tractatus' and 'Appellacio mulierum Bambergensium,' we do accept his theory that they are products of Eyb's pen, but for the internal reason only—not mentioned in the book—that they seem to keep so very close to the models after which they were written. Still, the question remains, why should Schedel have suppressed the author's name in his copies? And are we really sure that there had not been any humanistic tendencies in Bamberg before Albrecht?

The letter that follows was undoubtedly written by Eyb, but we do not believe with Mr. Herrmann that it was addressed to his friends in Italy. The letter is the fourth that the writer sent to the same person within a period of a few days, and to judge from the impatience with which answers are expected, it is clear that it cannot have been sent to a place very far away from the writer. Besides,

the sentence: "Vos nichilominus nature et pietatis officii, quo vincti sumus, memorem(!) effe scio," proves two things; namely, that the pronoun of the second person plural indicates but one person, and that this person is a relative of his. The way in which he expresses himself about his own brother Ludwig is another point in our favor. Who now was this relative whom he addresses as "patrone" (or are we to risk the conjecture "patruus"? "et preceptor optime" and before whom he parades his humanistic knowledge? None other, we think, than his cousin Johannes von Eyb, the learned licentiate in law, the owner of the three volumes of commentaries on the Decretals, afterwards in Albrecht's library. We now bring forward a hypothesis of our own in regard to the 'Sermon of Communion' and the 'Praise of the city of Bamberg,' both of which are found in the appendix of the 'Margarita poetica,' and have been attributed to Albrecht by Mr. Herrmann: they were written by Johannes von Eyb and Albrecht pays him the highest compliment by placing them among the works of Italian humanists, which he wished to be regarded as models of rhetorical art! If Albrecht was at all at Bamberg in 1452, it appears to us that this must, indeed, have been the time when he enjoyed the instruction (referred to in the 'Margarita poetica') of his much older cousin, who was provost of Ansbach and canon of the Bamberg cathedral. We do not know whether the instruction was given by word of mouth or by letters: but that Johannes was a man of culture, to whom even the more humanistic writers, for example, Cicero and Valerius Maximus, were well known, is shown by Mr. Herrmann himself (p. 15).

Our reason for not admitting Albrecht's authorship is that he does not claim the essays himself, and that they do not seem to contain any contributions from his memorable 'quotation book.' Their independence of style makes it impossible for us to believe that they were written by Albrecht, who was not very likely to write more than two or three lines without referring to some classic author to back him up. Since we do not know of anybody else with literary tastes in Bamberg at that time, we risk the supposition, against

Mr. Herrmann, that those essays were written by Johannes, not Albrecht, von Eyb. There are, however, three more treatises in that appendix which Mr. Herrmann attributes to Albrecht. We are told that we possess the official speeches, both of the 'doctorandus' and of the 'promotor,' delivered when Albrecht took his doctor's degree. But the reasons offered for such a statement are not at all convincing, though it *may* be as Mr. Herrmann says. It is certain that more than one was made a doctor of civil law under Sacco, and that Albrecht was not the only one who came from far away to take that academic honor, and, besides, the humanists were so generally fond of exaggerations, that we are not compelled to take their high-sounding phrases literally.

Now for the last and, perhaps, the most important essay, 'Clarissimarum feminarum laudacio,' as we find it in the appendix of Albrecht's large Latin book. As Mr. Herrmann himself recognizes (p.vi), Albrecht belonged to a group of men whose historic task and merit it was to introduce into Germany as many as possible of the treasures of classical literature, without changes either in form or contents. It seems to us as if there were too much independence and individuality of style and thought in that 'laudacio,' to let us attribute its authorship to Albrecht. We give him the honor of the second revised edition as it appears in the Munich cod. lat. 650, but not of the original conception as it exists in the above-named appendix. If we do not accept Mr. Herrmann's hypothesis on this point, the conclusions drawn from it must also fall; namely, that Niklas von Wyle in his sixteenth translation largely plagiarized Eyb's work. We believe that he simply used the same Latin original as Eyb, and the same explanation must be given in regard to the other passage which Wyle is alleged to have borrowed from Eyb. Those pleas for full liberty in literary subjects, especially about love in its more sensual aspects, did certainly not originate in Germany; they must have formed part of the apologies that the first humanists used against their narrow scholastic assailants. Both Wyle and Eyb went back to the same original, which they found among their humanistic

writings, gathered during their stay in Italy.

MAX BLAU.

Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass.

THE ENGLISH RELIGIOUS DRAMA.

The English Religious Drama. By Katherine Lee Bates. New York: MacMillan and Co., 1893. 8vo, pp. 254.

THIS work embodies a brief course of lectures delivered in the Summer School of Colorado Springs, July, 1893. These lectures have been recast as five chapters, the first of which deals with the Latin Passion plays and Saint plays, the second and third survey the Miracle or Mystery plays of England, and the fourth discusses the dramatic values of these plays. The fifth chapter treats of the Moralities, and recognizes the dependence of the Elizabethan drama upon these antecedent dramatic forms. A bibliography is appended, which is in large part a reproduction of Stoddard's "References for Students of Miracle Plays and Mysteries," but contains also some additional information in the form of notes.

It must be said that, viewed as lectures for a Summer School, these seem exceptionally compact and comprehensive,—a pretty severe course for a summer audience. The subject matter is foreign to the interests of the general student and is not easily unified, but Miss Bates' agreeable style effectually preserves her book from tediousness, although I fear that in a few places, perhaps in the *résumé* of the cycles, interest may have flagged.

The author has collected about all the information current among the authorities prior to and including ten Brink. These writers, with few exceptions, gathered striking, but often unrelated, facts about the plays, viewing them rather as curiosities of literature than as important works. They were not careful to distinguish modes of presentation that were continental from such as were English, or to mark the differences between plays that did not belong even to the same century. That an author, working at second-hand with such authorities, should occasionally draw a false inference or give undue emphasis, is to be expected. The reader, who is conversant with the chaotic accumulation of data with

which our author had to do, cannot but admire the skill with which she has given the semblance of connection and continuity to much that came to her without form.

The fair, yet cautious, interpretation so frequently met with in the book, reveals the pains-taking student, but renders it still more a matter for regret that much of the analytical study that has been expended upon the plays during the last few years seems strangely to have escaped notice. Thus, Hohlfeld, *Anglia*, vol. xi, would have been suggestive. Miss Toulmin Smith's discussion of the interrelations of the plays of Abraham and Isaac would surely have modified, somewhat, the statements regarding these plays, and the articles in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. vii, Nos. 3 and 6, together with the doctoral thesis, "Studies in the English Mystery Plays," published in 'The Transactions of the Conn. Academy of Sciences' Vol. ix, might have led to different conclusions in some instances.

It may be well to mention a few particulars in which later studies would seem to modify the old positions. A closer examination of the gild records reveals more clearly the unique character of the cycles by the craft gilds, and the great expense they entailed upon the gilds of the town. The natural inference is that such cycles would be few in number, and that many towns would content themselves with processional pageants, which could be made at small expense. The presumption (p. 141) that isolated plays "were but leaves from the cyclic play-book" of some town is, in my opinion, a presumption contrary to the evidence.

Again, ten Brink's position regarding the Dublin cycle, which is adopted by our author, is probably untenable. The French 'mystère mimée' sheds light upon the Aberdeen tableaux, and these interpret the evidence of the so-called Dublin cycle. It is probable that the plays of Dublin were all isolated plays, and that the 'cycle' of Dublin plays, so often referred to, was simply a series of processional tableaux.

The bearing of the Royal Entry upon the absence of a craft gild cycle in London, is an instance where broader study might have modified a statement. The ceremony of the

Royal Entry was a great financial burden upon the gilds of London, and necessitated outlay whenever the sovereign returned home, or a friendly monarch paid the city a visit. So onerous was the burden that the city of Canterbury, which was subject to frequent calls as lying on the route to Normandy, entertained outside the city walls, thus escaping the heavier exactions of the Royal Entry. It would seem that the gilds of London found the Royal Entry and the Lord Mayor's show so great an expense that they were unwilling to support a gild cycle. If we also grant that the cycle of the Parish clerks was probably modeled on the cycles of the Puy of Normandy, and had no connection with the plays of the craft gilds, it will no longer seem so strange, as the author thinks, p. 89, that no London cycle has been preserved.

The more careful study given of late to the Latin liturgical plays has led to a clearer understanding of the genesis of the cyclic play. One fails to see how the Saint plays could have contributed materially (p. 32) to the transition from liturgical plays to cyclic. The researches of Milchsack and Lange have made the process very clear by which the short liturgical plays were expanded and connected to form a series of plays. The Saint plays, doubtless, owed their origin to and fostered the popular passion for plays, but they ran their course in comparative independence of the cyclic plays, until the decadence of the Mystery was well begun.

It might be mentioned in passing that the author follows Klein in speaking (p. 7) of living tableaux in the fifth century. It would seem that Schaff, 'History of the Christian Church,' Vol. ii, p. 274, takes safer ground in referring to the same as allegorical pictures.

The statement (p. 23) that the quotation which follows is a description of Corpus Christi, as observed in London, drawn by the grudging hand of an Elizabethan Protestant, is one of those unfortunate slips that may chance to any of us. Hone was probably the trusted authority, and his slipshod statement misled our author. The quotation in question is from Googe's 'The Papish Kingdome,' the fourth book. Now, Googe's work is a translation of 'Regnum Papisticum' which was

written by Thomas Naogeorgus or Kirchmayer, a German, and was published at Basel, 1553 and 1559. It is not likely that Naogeorgus is referring particularly to the celebration in London.

But a truce to criticism. The points in question are for the most part such as concern the specialist alone. This book will render an important service, if from it the people learn to regard the Mysteries, not as an unaccountable and well-nigh blasphemous product of an ungodly age, but as the work of sincere and reverent men, and as the most faithful mirror we possess of the age in which they were written. Miss Bates has given us the first popular *résumé* of the subject from the stand-point of the unprejudiced student. The lectures will prove interesting and instructive to the general reader, and will be very serviceable to the specialist as a compact presentation of much widely scattered, but important information.

CHARLES DAVIDSON.

University of Indiana.

SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI.

Vie de Saint François d'Assise, par PAUL SABATIER, sixième édition, Paris: Fischbacher, 8vo, pp. cxxvi, 418, 1894.

STUDENTS of modern languages and literature cannot afford to let this book go unread. Its theme is in reality the one that interests them more than any other; namely, the specific elements of thought by which the Middle Ages modified ancient languages and literature and made them modern. It was through Italy that the narrow, but essential, rivulet of classical tradition wound its way downward towards the broader levels of the Renaissance. The new potentialities imparted to this stream in mediæval times have one central character,—they derive their force from an attempt to apply to life the ethical maxims of Christ. M. Sabatier evidently belongs to the school of French critics whose happy task it has been to reveal the human and poetical heart in Christ. His book might be entitled: "Francis of Assisi not churchman, but poet." And it is, in a satisfactory and legitimate sense, an application of Renan's method in the 'Vie de

Jésus' to this thirteenth-century hero, who was in person so true an imitation of Christ. If it seems to anyone that these observations are commonplace, and that such a discovery is not large enough to justify the writing of a new life of St. Francis, after the works of Thode, Hase, Chérancé, and Mrs. Oliphant, let him consider whether any man, saint, mystic, scholar, or priest, can contest with Francis the honor of being the first to make a systematic and lifelong effort to apply literally the Christian maxims of poverty and non-resistance, at the same time preserving a sweetness of disposition, a sense of nature, a poetical spirit, a music of the soul, which are no less truly Christian than the maxims themselves. It is for having been the first to adopt both practically and poetically the social and economic teachings of Christ, that St. Francis is not merely the most charming and lovable, but the most influential character of his time. He is the father of Italian literature, not merely because of those few lines of his which we account the first important monument of Italian speech, but because he struck the key in which its loftiest music was to be sounded. And this is, perhaps, why Dante dwells so long upon him, as if to pay his indebtedness to him, not alone as spiritual leader, but as one fit to be crowned,

col nome che più dura e più onora.

For one who has read appreciatively M. Sabatier's book, and plucked from it this core of truth that in St. Francis poet and mystic met, and that in his ears the myriad-voiced music of nature was divine, it is a grateful and imperative task to call attention to his fatherhood of Italian literature, and if that appear a truism, to make it seem less so. His using the vernacular is in keeping with all the effort of his spirit, which was humble, popular, helpful, and disposed to employ, and thereby dignify, the commonplaces of life,—water, sunshine, the speech of every day.

M. Sabatier has another thesis, which he has not worked out so well. It is that the church, jealous of the influence of St. Francis, forced him into a closer organic relation with herself than he desired, and that, therefore, the Franciscan orders were, even during his lifetime, a

departure from his original purpose. This may be true, but it seems to me that the proofs which underlie such conclusions are too narrow and insecure. They are mainly conjectural, being the silence and weakness of Francis in his later days, the changes in his rule, and the variance between Thomas of Celano and the Three Companians. A Catholic writer with the same texts before him might construe the matter differently. This note of controversy is an artistic defect in the book. It obtrudes itself unnecessarily, and clashes with the idyllic character of the purely biographical part, in which M. Sabatier has given a fine example of sympathetic appreciation.

The life is preceded by one hundred and twenty-six pages of excellent bibliographical criticism, and followed by several appendices, of which the one on the stigmata illustrates with what moderation M. Sabatier can treat a subject, where the testimony conflicts with his convictions. Judged by ordinary rules of testimony, St. Francis did receive the stigmata. It is only a good-tempered man who can admit this, though holding that no such thing was possible or really happened.

GEORGE MCLEAN HARPER.

Princeton University.

FRENCH AND SPANISH LITERATURE.

Contes de Balzac. Edited with Introduction and Notes by GEORGE MCLEAN HARPER, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of French in Princeton University and LEWIS EUGENE LIVINGWOOD, A. B., formerly Instructor in French and German in Princeton University. New York: William R. Jenkins, 8vo, pp. 218.

Juan Valera, El Pajaro Verde. Revised and Annotated for the use of English Students. By JULIO ROJAS, B. en-A. New York: William R. Jenkins, 32mo, pp. 83.

THE 'Contes de Balzac' is a collection of some of the shorter stories or character sketches of Honoré de Balzac. The notes are placed at the foot of the page, an arrangement justified by the character of the selections which are not intended for beginners.

The introduction was written by Professor Harper; it contains some general remarks on

the literary superiority of French novelists, and a sketch of the life of Honoré de Balzac, which is very cleverly done and might serve as a model for similar efforts. The notes are brief and sparingly used, yet they are sufficient for the purpose. On page 184 (middle of page) the phrase . . . *fit de Delbecq l'âme damnée de la comtesse* would seem to require a note on account of the peculiar use of the words *âme damnée*.—Page 185 (l. 13 from top) the text is probably not correct; at any rate, after *nouvelle* a period is required; *alors* begins a new sentence with a new idea.—Page 187 (l. 12 from top) an interrogation point is required after *filles*. On the same page (line 11 from bottom) *ces* should be *ses*.—Page 24 (l. 15 from top) there is a mistake in *s'étaient donc accords*.—Page 42 (l. 15 from top) we read *reapparaître* for *reparaître*.

The selections are made with much discrimination, and furnish good specimens of Balzac's style. Balzac treats principally of the abnormal and unhealthy in human nature, and his works are not to be recommended for general reading; but the reputation of the writer is so great that some acquaintance with his manner and method is desirable, while for those who wish to gain a good idea of the principal phases of French literature in this century, the study of Balzac is a necessity.

The book is beautifully printed and highly creditable to the enterprising publisher.

Juan Valera's 'El Pajaro verde' is an amusing little story well-adapted to the needs of the student of Spanish, with full notes by Julio Rojas, B. en-A. I note here a few incorrect accents:—Page 40, *dinero*; page 49, *eléfante*; page 50, *santidad*, *ermitaño*, *maldición*; page 54, *conveniente*, *incompleta*.—Page 7 (l. 9 from top) *basbante* should be, of course, *bastante*.

The notes, as is often the case in such works, are here and there mere translations into idiomatic English. It would have been better to call attention to the idiomatic use of certain words; for example, p. 5, l. 10: *Que ya llevaba el Rey siete años de matrimonio*, where the note translates *que ya llevaba el rey*, "That the King had already been," which does not help the student in construing *de matrimonio*.

C. A. EGGERT.

Vanderbilt University.

LITERARY CRITICISM.

L'Évolution de la Critique depuis la Renaissance jusqu'à Nos Jours, par F. BRUNETIÈRE. Deuxième édition. Paris: Hachette et Cie, 1892. 8vo, pp. 283.

THE volume bearing the above title is an introduction to the author's '*L'Évolution des Genres dans l'Histoire de la Littérature*,' which is to appear in three volumes. It is less than a history of French criticism and, in spite of the author's modest statement, more than a mere sketch of it, and were it even nothing but this, we should still be under great obligation to him for having discovered and welded into a solid chain, the many links that lay scattered over the mass of critical French literature accumulated in four centuries.

According to Brunetière, whose statements we follow here as closely as possible, modern criticism had its birth in Italy during the period of Renaissance, when the works of antiquity were to be classified and it was at first, therefore, chiefly philological. Passing from Italy to France this criticism became literary. Joachim du Bellay in his '*Défense et Illustration de la langue française*,' which appeared in 1550, recommends the imitation of the Greeks and Romans. His book becomes, as it were, the accepted standard of the poets of the Pléiade, and leads to a rupture with the traditions of the Middle Ages, even with Villon and Marot, and to an alienation of literature from national life.

Scaliger secured the triumph of Roman over Greek models, of Virgil over Homer, and of the Epistle to the Pisones over the Ethics of Aristotle.

Malherbe demanded that even inspiration should submit to logic, and always be able to give the how and the why of its fancy and caprice. Very much unlike Ronsard, who believed the essence of poesy to consist in the inner qualities of sensibility, fancy and imagination, Malherbe emphasized the outward or formal side such as order, clearness, logic, precision and regularity, which for almost two centuries became not the only, but the most prominent and universal features of French literature.

Applied criticism dates in France from

Chapelain's '*Sentiments de l'Académie sur le Cid*.' This criticism endeavors to base its judgments upon more general principles than the mere personal impressions of the critic, and to discover the laws and rules underlying the forms of literature.

Boileau preaches the imitation of nature, but only under the guidance of reason. To imitate nature reasonably means, in the first place, that we should imitate her only so far as she herself is reasonable, that is, conforms to her own plan. Hydrocephalus, for example, is an aberration from her own plan and, therefore, not an object for imitation.

In the second place, it means that we should imitate her only in so far as she is identical with herself in space and time, that is, in so far as she is universal and eternal. In other words, we should try to distinguish the permanent from the ephemeral, the principal from the secondary, the necessary from the accidental.

In the third place, it means that we should imitate nature only so far as she is intelligible and accessible to all. If Boileau so emphatically recommends the ancients as he does, it is simply because he finds that they imitated nature reasonably.

A movement of reaction from this worship of the ancients was led by Perrault against Boileau. Perrault, in defense of the Moderns, wrote his '*Parallèle des Anciens et des Modernes*,' wherein he enlarges the scope of criticism by extending it over the entire sphere of æsthetics in general. He constantly blends reflections on a strictly literary subject with those on the fine arts, illustrating the one by the other, and trying to bring them both under common principles.

The debate started by Perrault, led to the conviction that the rules and laws derived from the ancient models are not unchangeable, that there may be other models than those of antiquity, and that it is not impossible for modern authors to surpass the ancient. In other words, the belief in the absolute as represented by Boileau's rules and laws is shaken, and yields to a belief in a certain relativity in matters pertaining to art and literature.

Dubos wrote in a similar sense his '*Ré-*

flexions critiques sur la poésie et la peinture.' He was one of the first to measure the effect of the physical *milieu*, and of time as modifiers of literary form.

Diderot has a stronger claim than even Rousseau to the honor of having enlarged the definition of nature and of the natural in art. He insists upon a more faithful imitation of nature than those before him, and thus started what afterwards was called *naturalism*. The influence of naturalism, however, was counteracted for some time by the humanism of the eighteenth century, the last flickering of dying classicism whose exponent is Laharpe.

The idea of relativity, as conceived by Perrault, triumphs with Rousseau. While literature before him had been pre-eminently the expression of the ideas and sentiments of everybody, it becomes with Rousseau the expression of the particular and private ideas and sentiments of the author. I feel in one way, reasons Rousseau, and you, in another. Our ways of feeling are both legitimate because they are both natural. Only let us be natural by showing ourselves such as we are. But this means that there is no longer an ideal model or type in literature; no law or rule binding every one; the individual is sovereign, nothing is absolute, everything is relative.

With Mme de Staël criticism becomes philosophical. She studies Shakespeare and Goethe, and finds that there is a difference between the French and Teutonic taste; and that the debate on it cannot be decided by a passage from Aristotle or Boileau. The great advance made by Mme de Staël consists in the fact that she no longer considers a literary work as detached from its origin, but tries to determine its relation to the state of civilization whose product it is. This, too, tends to diminish the part of the absolute and to increase that of the relative.

Chateaubriand makes the description of external nature the soul of a new poesy; he teaches how to distinguish epochs and places, the means of their poetic reproduction, and compels criticism to take into account, merits for which it had no weight nor measure, nor even a vocabulary.

In consequence of Mme de Staël's broad and liberal views emphasizing the relative in

literature, Boileau's rigorous rules had lost their authority; the need of a new standard was, therefore, felt by which to judge of the merit of literary works, and to nobody was this want more evident than to Villemain, who holds that a literary work signifies and expresses more than itself and its author, that it is an exponent of the whole epoch. Villemain passes judgment, but according to other principles; the value of works is now measured by the quantity, complexity and delicacy of the relations which they express and by the wealth of their significance. Villemain's chief merit is that he made criticism historical; in his 'Tableau de la littérature française au 18^{me} siècle' he traces the influence of the other nations on the national literature; now, for the first time, it is represented as European. Besides, literary works are no longer merely classified and catalogued, but we see them act upon one another, either support or oppose one another, as well as associate themselves in a common movement.

Sainte-Beuve being interested in the authors as much as in their works, lays stress on the biographical side, and devotes twelve years of his life to composing literary portraits. In his 'Causeries du Lundi' he attacks the problem of what he calls "l'histoire naturelle des esprits;" starting from the fact that among human intellects, as among human faces, there are analogies and differences, he declares that the principal object of criticism must be to seek and to determine these relations; that there is no other way of accomplishing this than to proceed in the manner of naturalists, that is to say, by treatment in a series of monographs. The 'Causeries du Lundi,' in fact, are called by Brunetière a collection of monographs. Thus Sainte-Beuve's chief innovation in criticism is the application of the methods of natural history to the productions of literature.

Taine, who continues the literary tenets of Sainte-Beuve, is very explicit in stating his method.

"The modern method which I try to follow," he says, "consists in considering human works as facts and products, whose characteristics are to be marked and whose causes are to be investigated and nothing more. Thus understood, science neither proscribes nor pardons,

it merely ascertains and explains. It proceeds like botany which studies, with equal interest, the orange-tree and the fir-tree, the laurel and the birch; it is itself a kind of botany applied not to plants, but to human works."

Thus, criticism tends to become really scientific. Taine's principle is: just as all the parts of a living organism stand in correlation or in a necessary connection with one another, so all the parts of a work or of a man, or of an epoch, or of a given nation, form together a connected system, that is, no part of which can change without, thereby, causing a corresponding change in all the others. Therefore, the characteristics of any individual or of any period of civilization being given, Taine's effort has been to distinguish the principal traits from the secondary, to point out the dominant characteristic as that one in which a change causes change in all the rest, particular attention being given to the influence of the race, the *milieu* and the time.

As long as Taine was wrapped up in his strictly scientific method, he formally abstained from criticizing; for "science neither proscribes nor pardons"; yet later on he, too, felt the need of some æsthetic criterion and began, after finding it, to proscribe and to pardon. The value of a literary work is in his opinion proportionate to the degree of permanence or universality of the characteristic features which it expresses, a criterion which scarcely differs from that of Boileau.

Secondly, other things being equal, a work of beneficent character is, according to Taine, superior to a work of maleficent import.

His third principle is the degree of convergence of effects which he expresses thus:

"In a work of art the characteristics whose value we have recognized become as prominent as possible. It is only this way that they receive their brilliancy and relief. For this purpose it is evidently necessary that all the parts of the work should contribute to reveal them. . . . No element must remain inactive or draw the attention elsewhere: this would be a force employed in an opposite direction. All the effects must be convergent."

Taine forms the last link in Brunetière's chain. The next link will be Brunetière himself if he fulfills the promises given. He feels that after proclaiming the relative in literary work, criticism must sooner or later return to

the absolute under the name of beauty; yet he is far from belittling the scientific method of Sainte-Beuve and Taine. While admitting that criticism and natural history are two different things, that there is in man something else and something more than in nature, and that civilization differs from nature, he emphasizes that civilization, on the other hand, is not exclusively an outcome of the human will, but also a work of the instinct; that the productions of man, though differing from those of nature, have, nevertheless, some feature in common with them; that finally the works once detached from their authors live an independent life, and it is for all these reasons he contends that the knowledge of the laws of nature cannot help throwing much light on our understanding of the laws governing the development of human productions. But while Taine based his criticism on the analogies which it presents with the natural history methods of Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire and Cuvier, Brunetière proposes to himself to take for his guidance those furnished by Darwin and Haeckel.

H. C. O. Huss.

Princeton University.

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE IN ANGLO-SAXON.

The Gospel of Saint Luke in Anglo-Saxon, edited from the manuscripts with an Introduction, Notes and Glossary by JAMES W. BRIGHT, Ph.D. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1893. 12mo, pp. xix, 158.

IN this little volume, which comes with the careful editing of Dr. Bright and the comely typography of the Clarendon Press, we have an earnest of a new edition of the Gospels in Old English. All will appreciate the desirability of such work when it is considered that, except for Professor Skeat's admirable synoptical version, we have no edition adequately representing the scholarship of today. Yet the Gospels, although not in standard West-Saxon, give the easiest introduction to English of the oldest period.

Dr. Bright's editorial work consists of an Introduction especially describing the manuscripts, their interrelations, and the printed

editions preceeding this; a careful editing of the text with some emendations, and variant readings at the foot of the page; besides a few pages of Notes and a Glossary. Textual changes are indicated in all cases either by italics, or, if additions, by bracketed words,—a most commendable practice. The notes are mainly given up to indicating the close relation between the Old English and the Vulgate from which the translation was, of course, made. The glossary is concise, but ample for a book, the contents of which is so familiar. But one improvement can be suggested, and the reviewer recognizes this as a matter of personal judgment, rather than one which would materially affect the use of the book. If the paragraphing of the original text were not to be followed, we should have preferred to see the divisions of the revised version chosen rather than the old "verses."

The present edition ought to be of special value in helping to introduce the sadly neglected study of the older language into the schools. One difficulty hitherto has been that easy prose texts were not available. But this cannot longer be said, when such a neat and handy book as that of Dr. Bright may be so readily purchased. We trust, also, that the complete edition of the Gospels will not be long delayed. Such an edition is as necessary for scholarly work as this single Gospel for school use.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Cornell University.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Beowulf. Aeltestes deutsches Heldengedicht.

Aus dem Angelsächsischen übertragen von P. Hoffmann. Oerlag von Herm. Liebich, Züllichau: 8vo, pp. iii, 183, 1893.

THIS is a book that deserves some praise and much blame. Hoffmann has given us the last and the most readable of all the different German translations of 'Beowulf'; the style is simple and easy, and the ear is not annoyed by a conscious or clumsy striving after effect. In respect to meter he makes a new departure, and uses the verse of the 'Nibelungenlied' with a rather free hand, but quite skillfully. He has a clever trick of versifying and his

rime is accurate, but he lacks the true spirit of poetry, and often adds a touch that mutilates the sense or altogether mars the simple beauty of the original. For example, *þær him hel onfeng* (l. 852), is rendered "die tiefe Hölle nahm ihn auf"; and again,

*þæt heo þone fyrdhom þurhfon ne mihte
locene leoðosyrca laðan fingrum,*

(l. 1504-5)

is translated

"Mit ihren grausen Fängen die Brünne wollte sie,
Das Kettenhemd, durchboren, das war verlor'ne Müh'."

Such examples are very frequent, and the author shows the same lack of true feeling when the sonorous and poetical name, *Heorot*, is translated into "Hirschburg."

These are, however, minor faults and the translation in itself may be called good, very good, but it would be too much to say that it correctly represents the original or gives even a fair idea of it. In fact, Hoffmann's translation is no more like 'Beowulf' than a regiment on dress parade is like the same regiment in battle. The rugged force and picturesqueness of the original is toned down and at times entirely lost. The description of the pool on the lonely moor (ll. 1357-1376), loses half its horror in the translation. The translation is too modern in tone,—this is its great weakness. In attempting to correct the obscurity of the earlier translators our author has gone too far, and many suggestive Anglo-Saxon words (such as *beodgeneatas*, l. 343), which could be easily translated into corresponding German words, have been diluted into phrases. The epic flavor of the whole piece is adulterated, and Beowulf himself undergoes such a change of dress that we hardly recognise our old hero. Most of these faults are due to the choice of meter, which renders diffuseness of expression almost necessary, and causes the author to resort to much padding to fill out his line. He even adds some similes to the four already in 'Beowulf'; "wie Wetterstrahlen" (p. 68); "dem Strahl des Blitzes gleich" (p. 117).

The text is very well adhered to, and the author has omitted only a few lines in the last part that are mere repetitions. On the other

¹ To prevent confusion, the edition of 'Beowulf' quoted is the one Hoffmann has used, viz., Grein, 1867.

hand, the 'Finnsburg Fragment' has been inserted in the body of the text after l. 1067 (Grein), and the author has undertaken "what no one before him has yet attempted," namely, to write for the 'Fragment' a beginning and an end! The following are the lines in question (p. 44):—

In Finnesburg der Feste ein Held der Warte pfleg
Auf dem hohen Walle, noch nahte nicht der Tag;
Da stieg ein blutiger Glanz empor am Meeresstrand
Als ob in Flammen stünde der Himmel und das Land.

"Was zuckt und gleisst da drüben, wie ferner Blitze
Sprühn?
Was leuchtet dort und lodert wie lichter Lohe Glühn?"
So sprach der junge Kriegsfürst, etc.

Then follows the 'Fragment,' and then Hoffmann's addition (p. 46):—

"Wen hat das Schwert gefressen der Streiter Dein, der
jungen?"

Da sprach der edle Degen: "Nun sei dem Schöpfer
Dank,
Dass meinen holden Freunden solch' schöner Sieg gelang!
Der keiner ist gefallen! Mir zum Gedächtnismahl
Den Hügel türnet; denn schauen soll ich der Seligen
Saal."

Hoffmann has thus kept on very safe ground, and the general utility of the translation is certainly increased by this setting.

Hoffmann uses Grein's text of 1867, and, although he says it is not his purpose to give a critical translation, still it is a pity he does not depart from Grein enough to avoid many glaring errors which later criticism has corrected. For example, he makes the cavern lighted up by the gleaming of the sword (l. 1570), and makes Grendel carry a sack over his shoulder to receive plunder (l. 2085),—and many such instances could be brought forward. To the student of Anglo-Saxon the value of this book may be said to be *nil*; beyond the Grein of 1867 the author does not go, many of his statements are extremely careless, and he shows the lack not only of the critical faculty but of a critical conscience.

In the preface he says that the translation of Simrock (1859) is 'the first which truly represents the beauty of the poem,' which might be true or not as far as he is concerned, for a line or two above he admits that he has not read Ettmüller's translation (1840), or Grein's (1857). Then after properly charactersing the translation of Wolzogen (1872), he says; "Seit

Wolzogen hat Niemand, wie es scheint, den Mut gefunden eine neue Uebersetzung zu wagen," entirely overlooking a translation by Zinsser in 1881. In this connection should also be mentioned the revised edition of Grein's translation, published in 1883 after his death.

But the two faults mentioned above, the lack of a critical faculty and of a critical conscience, become very conspicuous in the forty-five pages of notes, which the author has added to his translation. These may be properly characterised as worthless. The fountain of the author's knowledge seems to be Simrock, only tinged with his own unreasoning sense of what might have been. Of the great mass of modern criticism the author appears to be entirely ignorant, and there is not so much as a foot-note or reference to any critical opinion throughout the book. The author gives us first a short "Geschichte des Textes" (p. 139), which is merely an abstract of Grein's 'Beowulf,' Cassel, 1867, p. 181, most of the words and phrases being identical. Hoffmann has omitted to mention this fact.

He next attempts to fix 'Beowulf' chronologically by a comparison with 'Widsiþ,' where some of the princes mentioned are historical, giving us in very confused form, but as an original argument, matter that has been common property since the time of Kemble. In an extended and somewhat mechanical account of early Germanic life and manners (pp. 146-164), formulated from scattered lines in the 'Beowulf,' there is nothing of much interest; it is only a fairly good presentation of what has been said much better elsewhere.

In a note dealing with the fight at Finnsburg, Hoffmann refers most indefinitely to a story in Grässe's 'Preussischen Sagen,' where, he says, "erscheint auf den Inseln der Nordsee noch ein Nachklang dieses Kampfes," from which he draws several conclusions. Upon investigation this turns out to be the old, old story. The reference to the 'Sagenbuch' is Vol. ii, p. 1012, No. 1245, "Der Meermann und die Zwerge auf Sylt," but this tale is taken from Hansen's 'Friesische Sagen,' Altona, 1858, p.

² A portion of this only, comprising the first 837 lines of 'Beowulf,' was published in the *Jahresbericht über die Real-schule zu Forbach*, 1882.

52 ff., and the whole matter of the island of Sylt is treated by Möller, 'Das altenglische Volksepos,' Kiel, 1883, p. 74 ff., where references to Hansen are given and the saga is quoted.

Hoffmann next compares the story of *þrypo* (*Modþrypo* as he calls her) with the Anglian saga of Queen Orda (or Drida), which has been a more than twice told tale since Grein completed Kemble's discovery by the identification of *þrypo* with Drida. Hoffmann brings this forward without acknowledging any indebtedness.

All that is told on p. 168 concerning the *Brosinga mene* can be found in Simrock, p. 185-86, although again our author does not supply the cross-reference. The same may be said of the note on *Hygelac*, p. 169; Simrock, p. 183-185, has covered the same ground. There is a long note on *Ongenþeow* (p. 170 ff. containing matter all given by Simrock (p. 191-2); the only new or original thing adduced is the almost groundless guess that the woman over whom *Hæthcyn* and *Ongenþeow* fought at *Hrefnesholt* was the sister or daughter of *Meaca*, a Merovingian prince mentioned by the 'Widsið.' Hoffmann refuses to believe that the account of Sigmund's fight with the dragon has anything to do with the Siegfried saga, but thinks it is independent and original; his only reason seems to be,—“es ist eben von den deutschen Sagen sehr Vieles verloren gegangen” (p. 174).

In conclusion the author considers the poetical value of the 'Beowulf,' following the views of Simrock (p. 194-196), in the main, but departing from him in one important particular, namely, the harm done by the Christian revision. Hoffmann here takes occasion to affirm with great positiveness his belief that the Christian element is an original trait of the poem, but he fails to show that he has any right to formulate an opinion on the subject.

The author's object in writing this book was, as he tells us, a patriotic one, and he keeps this aim ever before him. He calls 'Beowulf' the "ältestes deutsches Heldengedicht," and except for two or three casual references to the Anglo-Saxon, he speaks of it as if it were an Old High German epic. This book may extend the popular knowledge of old German-

ic life, for it is very pleasant reading, and so accomplish the author's avowed object,—and let us hope it may, but there can be no valid excuse for giving such careless and unscientific work to the public.

GEORGE SHIPLEY.

Johns Hopkins University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur von MAX KOCH. Stuttgart: G. J. Göschen'sche Verlagshandlung, 1893. (Sammlung Göschen No. 31.) 8vo, pp. 278. Preis M. 0,80.

THE mere fact that a scholar like Prof. Koch, the author of many important treatises on subjects connected with the German and English literatures, the editor of several volumes in Kürschner's 'National Litteratur,' and that important periodical *Zeitschrift f. vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, and one of the greatest authorities on Richard Wagner, is the author of the little book before us, should be warrant enough that it is valuable, and is free from the faults of most popular or concise works on the subject.

Prof. Koch's intimate knowledge of German literature and his keen appreciation of the influence of foreign, particularly of English, thought on Germany, qualify him singularly well for the task of presenting the evolution of German letters; and he has, consequently, managed to put into two hundred and seventy-two pages the maximum amount of valuable and scholarly information compatible with clearness.

The book is divided into three sections: i. Aelteste Zeit und Mittelalter, ii. Reformation und Renaissance, iii. Das achtzehnte und neunzehnte Jahrhundert, each of which is subdivided into five or six chapters. The last of these, significantly enough, is entitled, 'Von Goethe's Tod bis zu den Bayreuther Festspielen,' Prof. Koch thus giving Wagner that eminent position in German literature which is due to him, and which has hitherto been granted him only in music. At the beginning of each section and of each chapter are footnotes, which contain lists of the most important works dealing with the period under treatment. The fact that important works only are quoted will be a source of pleasure to

all teachers who have had to use books in which the authors cheerfully mention rubbish side by side with standard works, thus blurring the judgment of the student. Much as we appreciate the scholarship and discrimination shown in these notes, we cannot help sincerely regretting that Scherer's 'History of German Literature' and H. Grimm's 'Goethe' found no place in them.

The desire to give each writer his due is the controlling and a most valuable feature of the book. It becomes most manifest in Prof. Koch's treatment of Wagner and of Schack. Wherever it is possible, he insists on the immense importance of Wagner for German literature, and ranks him among the great German dramatists; to us, indeed, he is the only absolutely original modern German dramatist, as the others, even the greatest, were so largely influenced by French, English, or classic ideas. In speaking of Schack (p. 260), Prof. Koch pays a noble tribute to a man who stands for profound and healthy culture in the sense in which the Renaissance-men, or Goethe, stood for it, and who is neglected by a generation which, unfortunately, so often regards literature and art merely as records of the past. In one case, we should have been glad to see greater warmth displayed, namely, in the discussion of the *Nibelungenlied* (p. 39); to us the *Nibelungenlied* is the greatest epic of the Christian era, and Siegfried as irresistibly fascinating in his way as Don Juan in his, and as characteristic a figure for Germany as the latter is for Spain.

Prof. Koch has the rare and happy gift of connecting distant phenomena. Again and again, he shows how the same forces produced similar results at different times or in different countries; for example, on p. 16, where he says:

"Der Erzählung selbst liess er [Otfried] die Erklärung *moraliter* und *spiritualiter* folgen, wie im 14. Jahrh. der Dichter der göttlichen Komödie neben der wörtlichen Auslegung eine dreifache nach dem Sinne forderte."

He betrays the same gift wherever he speaks of the treatment of Arthurian legends, or Siegfried stories, in different periods (for example, p. 35, p. 40, etc.). He is equally felicitous in contrasts; for example, on p. 15, in discussing the *Heliand's* and *Klopstock's*

attitude towards the Bible, or on p. 79, in pointing out what the Renaissance meant to Italy and what it meant to Germany.

The book is a treasure-house of information, and being the work of one who masters and who loves German literature, it ought to be very welcome to teachers and to students of that literature, and ought to help along the sincere and growing interest in German intellectual life which has been manifest for several years in the United States.

C. VON KLENZE.

Chicago University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A GERMAN BORROWER OF WOTTON AND RALEIGH.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In *Notes and Queries (First Series, 9, 420)* a question is raised as to a possible point of contact between Sir Henry Wotton and George Rudolph Weckerlin. It arises from the fact that in the works of the latter, the writer discovered a parallel to Wotton's well known lines "To His Mistress, Elizabeth of Bohemia": the lines begin: "You meaner beauties of the night." The writer inferred that Wotton was the borrower.

I have been unable to procure a copy of the complete poems of Weckerlin, and can, therefore, say nothing on this particular point; but in looking up the matter, I have found a still more interesting point of contact between the literatures of the two countries, in a literal translation by Weckerlin of the poem "The Lie," usually, though not certainly, attributed to Sir Walter Raleigh.

"The Lie" was an exceedingly popular poem, and is found in varying forms in MSS. as far back as 1593 (Campbell, 'Specimens,' p. 57, 2nd ed.). It was certainly in print by 1608 (Davison's 'Poetical Rhapsody,' 2nd ed. Reprint of Sir Harris Nicolas p. 24), and frequently reprinted later. Now Weckerlin lived between 1584 and 1651, published first apparently in 1618 and later in 1641 and 1648 certain 'Geistliche und weltliche Gedichte.' He lived much in London, enjoying the favor of James I. and Charles I. successively, and has

the general reputation of imitating French and English authors. Here, however, is a definite instance. I quote a couple of stanzas of "The Lie," followed by as many of *Die Lüge* (the former from 'Poems of Wotton and Raleigh,' ed. Hannah, 1845, p. 99; the latter from Müller's 'Bibliothek deutscher Dichter des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts,' ed. 1823, p. 73).

Go, soul, the body's guest,
Upon a thankless arrant;
Fear not to touch the best;—
The truth shall be thy warrant:
Go, since I needs must die
And give the world the lie.
Say to the Court, it glows
And shines like rotten wood;
Say to the Church, it shows
What's good and doth no good:
If Church and Court reply
Then give them both the lie, etc.
Geh durch die Welt, o meine Seel',
Der Welt Undankbarkeit zu sehen!
Sag' Jedem ohn' Scheu seinen Fehl,
Die Wahrheit selbst soll dir beistehen.
Kann ja die Welt nichts, denn betrügen,
So heiss sie öffentlich rund lügen.
Dem Hof sag,' dass sein' Pracht und Ehr,'
Wie faul Holz, unbeständig scheinen;
Der Kirche sag,' was ihre Lehr'
Gut heisset, ihre Werk' verneinen;
Und sagen sie: du bist betrogen,
So sag' ohn' Scham: es ist erlogen. u.s.w.

There can be no question as to the borrower in this case with the dates before us as above. Considering that the earliest published poems of Weckerlin bear the date 1618, and that Wotton's verses on Elizabeth of Bohemia were probably written about 1620 (See Hannah, as above, p. 13), before Weckerlin came to England, I think it probable that a complete edition of the German author will exhibit him a borrower of Wotton as well as Raleigh. I should be glad to have further light on this question.

P. S.—Since writing this, I notice in the last number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, the publication of a dissertation by Dr. W. Bohn, Göthengen, "Englands Einfluss auf Georg Rudolf Weckerlin": this I have not yet received.

FELIX E. SCHELLING.

University of Pennsylvania.

QUERY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Can any one inform me of the author-

ship and date of appearance of a poem of ten lines beginning "Though others may her brow adore," published in Palgrave's 'Golden Treasury,' p. 21 (ed. 1892)?

F. E. SCHELLING.

University of Penna.

CHAUCER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In Skeat's edition of Chaucer's 'Legend of Good Women,' p. 70, occur these lines (=Legend of Dido, ll. 1336-40):

"Which cloth, whan sely Dido gan awake,
She hath hit kist ful ofte for his sake;
And seide, 'O cloth, whyl Iupiter hit leste,
Tak now my soule, unbind me of this unreste!
I have fulfild of fortune al the cours.'"

"Here the *cloth*," says Skeat, "answers to the Lat. *exuviae*; and *whyl hit leste*=whilst it pleased. These three lines are a close imitation of Vergil, 'Æn.' iv. 651-3:—

'Dulces exuviae, dum fata Deusque sinebant;
Accipite hanc animam, meque his exsoluite curis;
Vixi, et quem dederat cursum fortuna, peregi.'

—Notes, p. 166.

Skeat's footnote, however, reads, "All but T. A [=MS. Trin. Coll. Cam. R. 3, 19, and MS. Arch. Selden B. 24] wrongly insert 'swete' after 'O.'"

But why "wrongly"? The omission of "swete" not only makes Chaucer blunder over a very simple Latin sentence, but leaves his temporal clause, "whyl hit leste," suspended, as it were, in mid air. This clause can modify only "swete," as the clause introduced by "dum" modifies "dulces." Dido is apostrophizing the Trojan vestments left by Æneas: "O relics, dear while (=so long as) God and the Fates permitted."

What possible meaning is there in "O cloth, whyl Iupiter hit leste"?

The omission of "seide," demanded by the metre, finds an exact parallel in ll. 879, 1538, 1761, and 2689.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH.

La. State Univ. and A. and M. Coll.

"FAR FROM THIS."

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—"John struck James? Oh, no; far from

- John struck James (1)
- John strike James (2)
- John striking James (3)
- John's striking James (4)

James struck John." Of these forms only (3) and (4) are in use. With a pronoun for John, we cannot say, as some peoples can: "Far from

he struck James
 he strike James
 him strike James
 he striking James
 him striking James
 etc., etc.,"

but we say: "Far from his striking James." The uninflected "this" I have always apprehended as the analog of John in (3); "Far from this being the case" parallels "Far from John being the man." But far from this being absolute, I am ready to admit the possibility of a very different view being taken at other times and by other minds.

ANDREW INGRAHAM.

The Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass.

THE FOUNDER OF ROMANCE PHILOLOGY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—The one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Friedrich Diez was celebrated in a very fitting manner at Columbia College, New York, on Thursday, March 15th, 1894. The celebration was held at Columbia under the auspices of the Romance Department, which is now a strongly manned and representative body, and no doubt was inspired by the enthusiasm of Prof. Adolphe Cohn and his associates; but the occasion was in no sense local. It was really a tribute of the Universities of America to the memory of the Founder of Romance Philology. Though the celebration occurred at the busiest season of the year, representatives of thirteen universities and colleges took part in the formal proceedings; twenty-three institutions, including Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Johns Hopkins, University of the City of New York, Cornell, Rutgers, University of Chicago, were represented by a hundred and fifty delegates; and letters regretting enforced absence and expressing sympathy and interest were received from a score of other colleges.

The celebration was opened on Thursday afternoon with an address of welcome by President Low of Columbia. Prof. A. Marshall Elliott, of Johns Hopkins University, was chosen presiding officer. The formal public exercises consisted in the presentation of tribute to the general subject which engrossed the attention of Friedrich Diez; in the presenting of reviews of the work done by the great scholar; and in the presenting of the facts and incidents of the life of Diez, as man and professor. As personal tribute to the scholar Diez, Prof. H. A. Tood, of Columbia, gave a paper on "Diez and the Study of Romance Philology." For the appreciation of the work done by Diez, Prof. Cohn, of Columbia, gave a paper on "The Life and Labors of Diez's French forerunner, Raynouard"; Prof. Samuel Garner, of the United States Naval Academy gave a paper on "One of Diez's Etymologies"; Prof. H. R. Lang, of Yale University, gave a valuable paper on "Diez and the Study of Mediæval Portuguese Poetry"; and Prof. Thomas R. Price, of Columbia, gave a remarkably suggestive paper on "The Work of Diez for English Philology."

The eleven remaining papers were contributions to scholarship in the field in which Diez most labored. Prof. E. S. Sheldon, of Harvard, gave a paper "On Anglo-French *au* for French *a* before a nasal," which announced a conclusion of special interest; Prof. J. E. Matzke, of Stanford, sent a paper on the "Pronunciation of the old French diphthong *ue* from Latin *o*"; Prof. E. S. Lewis, of Princeton, gave a paper on the "Development of the Intervocalic Labials in the Romance Languages"; Prof. J. S. Sheffoe, of The Woman's College of Baltimore, a paper on "An Etymological Glossary of the Jersey-French Dialect"; and Prof. C. H. Grandgent of the Boston Public Schools, gave a discussion of a phonetic problem, under the title "Sense or Cents." As contributions to the study of the early literature, Prof. F. M. Warren of Adelbert College, gave a paper on "The Greek Novel and the Spanish Romance of Chivalry"; Prof. A. N. van Daell, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, sent some "Notes on Early Prose Fiction in France"; Prof. H. A. Rennert, of University of Pennsylvania, sent a study of "Some Unpublished

Poems of Hernan Perez de Guzman"; and Prof. Alcée Fortier, of Tulane University, sent a paper on "A Louisiana Folk-Tale in the Creole dialect," which was read, in the absence of Prof. Fortier, by Prof. Cohn. Two very valuable contributions were given by Prof. A. M. Elliott, of Johns Hopkins University, presenting the results of a study of "The Source of one of the Marie-de-France Fables," and by Prof. G. L. Kittredge, of Harvard, who answered the question "Who was Sir Thomas Malory?" Prof. Kittredge appears to have found Malory beyond a reasonable doubt and has earned the thanks of students by clearing up a mystery.

At the close of the exercises Professor Elliott presented the Romance Department of Columbia with a photograph of the house at Giessen, in which Diez was born, decorated as it was on the day of Diez's University *Jubiläum*, at which Professor Elliott was present. Professor Cohn presented a letter of congratulation addressed to the University of Bonn to which was set down about one hundred and fifty signatures. It ran as follows:

To the Rector and Senate of the University of Bonn,

The undersigned, representatives of American Colleges and Universities gathered at Columbia College to celebrate the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Friedrich Diez, wish to congratulate the Rhenish Frederick William University upon having so long numbered among its respected Professors the illustrious founder of Romance Philology. New York, March 15th, 1894.

After the formal exercises the delegates were most hospitably entertained by President and Mrs. Low at a reception at the President's house, and this courtesy was followed by a less formal though not less enjoyable hospitality, *Souper-Kneipe*, offered by the Romance Department of Columbia.

In his letter of regret Professor Huss of Princeton said:

"Die von Ihnen veranstaltete Feier des hundertjährigen Geburtstags von Friederich Diez ist mir ein unverkennbares und höchst erfreuliches Symptom für das Fallen nationaler Schranken auf dem Gebiete der Wissenschaft."

I have no doubt that all the delegates present heartily agree with Professor Huss,

and that they rejoice that the celebration was in every respect so successful.

FRANCIS H. STODDARD.

University of the City of New York.

BRIEF MENTION.

The *Open Court* Publishing Company of Chicago has reprinted in book form (as vol. i, no. 3, of the "Religion of Science Library," November, 1893), 'Three Lectures on the Science of Language' by F. Max Müller (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. v, pp. 61-62), together with a Supplement entitled, "My Predecessor," an essay on the genesis of the Science of thought, originally published in the *Contemporary Review*, vol. liv. The subjects treated in these lectures are as follows: 1. Man and Animal. No mystery in Language.—2. Analysis of language. The Lesson of the Science of Language.—3. Thought thicker than Blood. The Cradle of the Aryas. The Importance of Sanskrit. 112 pp.; price, 25 c.

As no. 4 of the same library (January, 1894), the Publishing Company named above has issued an authorized English translation of Professor Th. Ribot's interesting work, 'The Diseases of Personality' (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. vi, p. 191). 157 pp.; price, 25 cts.

We desire to call special attention of Romance and English students to the second edition of a valuable catalogue of dissertations, etc., published seventeen years ago by Professor Varnhagen, of the University of Erlangen. The altered title runs: Systematisches Verzeichnis der Programmabhandlungen, Dissertationen und Habilitationsschriften aus dem Gebiete der romanischen und englischen Philologie sowie der allgemeinen Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaften und der Pädagogik und Methodik. Von Herman Varnhagen. Zweite vollständig umgearbeitete Auflage, besorgt von Johannes Martin.

In this edition we have almost an entirely new book; the Introduction of the first issue has been materially shortened, but little change has been made in the arrangement of the material which is distributed in the following general categories: 1. Die Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft überhaupt (pp. 1-33).—2. Die Romanische Philologie (pp. 35-163).—3. Die Englische Philologie (pp. 164-200).—4. Pädagogik und Methodik (pp. 227-260). A complete Register closes the work that represents no less than three thousand four hundred and fifty-three titles. Leipzig, Koch's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1893. 8vo, pp. 296.

PERSONAL.

Dr. J. D. Bruner (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. viii, p. 256) has just been appointed Professor of the Romance Languages in the University of Illinois, Champaign.

JOURNAL NOTICES.

RASSEGNA BIBLIOGRAFICA DELLA LETTERATURA ITALIANA. VOL. I, 1893.—D'Ovidio, F., *Per i plagiarj del Tolomei*.—Sanesi, I., *Un documento inedito su Gio. Boccaccio*.—Dejob, Ch., *La 10a. Novella dell'ottava giorn. del "Decameron" ed "El Anzuelo de Fenisa" di Lope de Vega*.—Sensì, F., *Il Tolomei e la rima*.—Paris, G., *Anseïs de Carthage et la "Seconda Spagna"*.—Medin, A., *Il quarto libro del poemetto drammatico sul Lautrec*.—Crescini, V., *Di un nuovo documento su Gio. Boccaccio*.—Brouwer, F., *Intorno alla unità di luogo nella "Rosmunda" del Rucellai*.—Flamini, F., *Le Egloghe di P. J. De Jennaro*.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEUTSCHE PHILOLOGIE. VOL. XXVI. NO. 1.—Zingerle, I. v., *Worterkklärungen*.—Jiriczek, O. L., *Mitteilungen aus ungedruckten Arnamagnanischen handschriften*.—Gering, H., *Zur Lieder-Edda*.—Klaiber, *Lutherana*.—Roth, F. W. E., *Mitteilungen aus handschriften und älteren druckwerken*.—Bolte, J., *Eine protestantische Moralität von Alexander Seitz*.—Spanier, M., und Hofmann, K., *Zu J. Chr. Günther's Gedichten*.—Duentzer, H., *Goethe's Epilog zu Schillers Glocke*.—Roehrich, E., *Bemerkungen zu Schillerschen balladen*.—Steffenhagen, *Eine Sachsenspiegelhandschrift*.—NO. 2.—Gering, H., *Der zweite Merseburger spruch*.—Meyer, R. M., *Alliterierende doppelconsonanz im Heliand*.—Sprenger, R., *Textkritisches zu mittelniederdeutschen gedichten*.—Jettles, A., *Das neuhochdeutsche pronomen*.—Spanier, M., *Tanz und Lied bei Thomas Murner*.—Hofmann, K., *Neues zum leben und dichten J. Chr. Günthers*.—Schoene, A., *Zu Lessings Emilia Galotti*.—Birlinger, A., *Lexikalisches*.—NO. 3.—Gering, H., *Drauma-Jóns saga*.—Jackel, H., *Der name Germanen*.—Sprenger, R., *Zu Konrad von Fussesbrunnen Kindheit Jesu*.—Spanier, M., *Ein brief Thomas Murners*.—Schmidt, A., *Die briefe von Goethes mutter an ihren sohn, als quelle zu seinen werken*.—Detter, F., *Bericht über die verhandlungen der germanistischen section der xxxii. philologenversammlung in Wien*.—NO. 4.—Kettner, E., *Die plusstrophen der Nibelungenhandschrift B.*—Zum Orendel. —Giske, H., *Zu Walther 88, 1-8*.—Kauffmann, F., und Gering, H., *Noch einmal der zweite Merseburger spruch*.—Roth, F. W. E., *Zur literatur deutscher drucke des 15. und 16. jahrhunderts*.—Binz, G., *Johann Rassers spiel von der kinderzucht*.—Hoenig, B., *Nachträge und zusätze zu den bisherigen erklärungen Bürgerscher gedichte*.—Branky, F., *Vulgärnamen der eule*.—Friedwagner, M., *Bericht über die verhandlungen der romanischen section der xxxii. philologenversammlung in Wien*.

ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITTERATUREN. XCI. BAND. I HEFT.—Koch, J., *Kleine Beiträge zur englischen Grammatik*.—Cloetta, Wilhelm, *Zu Jean Bodel (Adam de la Halle und Baude Fastoul)*.—Vollhardt, William, *Die Quelle von Molières Tartuffe*.—Sitzungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für das Studium der neueren Sprachen. —*Beurteilungen und kurze Anzeigen*.—Rodiger, Max, *Karl Lachmanns Briefe an Moriz Haupt*.

Herausgegeben von J. Vahlen.—Mueller, Ad., Adolf Mager, *Geschichte der englischen Litteratur von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*.—Mueller, Ad., *English Grammar, Part I. Einführung in die englische Sprache u. s. w.* Bearbeitet von Dr. Heinrich Löwe.—*England and the English. Neues englisches Lesebuch für deutsche Schulen. Unterstufe u. s. w.* Herausgegeben von Dr. Heinrich Löwe.—Opitz, G., *Englisches Übungsbuch von Dr. Ew. Görlich*.—Mueller, Ad., E. H. Barnstorff, *Lehr- und Lesebuch der englischen Sprache*.—Opitz, G., *Englisches Lesebuch von Johs. Schmarje und E. H. Barnstorff*.—Opitz, G., *Englische Chrestomathie für Schulen und Privatunterricht. Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen und Wörterbuch von Dr. L. Stipfle. 8. Auflage*.—Z., J., *Island Nights' Entertainments, consisting of the Reach of Falesá. The Bottle Imp. The Isle of Voices. By Robert Louis Stevenson*.—Z., J., *A Secret Mission. By E. Gerard*.—Z., J., *A Conquering Heroine and 'When in Doubt.' By Mrs. Hungerford*.—Z., J., *Black and White. By F. C. Phillips*.—Z., J., *Euthanasia; or, Turf, Tent and Tomb*.—Z., J., *Timothy's Quest. By Kate Douglas Wiggin*.—Z., J., *The L. 1,000,000 Bank-Note and other New Stories. By Mark Twain*.—Z., J., *"I forbid the Banns." The Story of a Comedy which was played seriously. By Frank Frankford Moore*.—Z., J., *The Tauchnitz Magazine. xxii (May)*.—Z., J., *Tractatus de diversis historiis Romanorum et quibusdam aliis. Verfasst in Bologna im Jahre 1326. Nach einer Handschrift in Wolfenbüttel herausgegeben von Solomon Herzstein*.—Krause, Arn., Dr. Max Banner, *Französisches Lese- und Übungsbuch. Erster Kursus*.—Tobler, Adolf, *Ille und Galeron von Walter von Arras ... herausgegeben von Wendelin Foerster*.—Hoelscher, L., *Programmschau. Verzeichnis der vom 3. Juni bis zum 21. Juli 1893 bei der Redaktion eingelaufenen Druckschriften*.—2. u. 3. HEFT.—Leitzmann, Albert, *Ungedruckte Briefe Georg Försters iv. 1.*—Foerster, Max, *Zu den Blickling Homiles*.—Zupitza, Julius, *Das Leben der heiligen Maria Magdalena in me. Prosa aus einer Handschrift der Cathedral-Bibliothek zu Durham*.—Rosenberg, Felix, *Über Saint-Lamberts Jahreszeiten*.—Kleine Mitteilungen.—Schlipper, J., *Zu Dunbar*.—Schultz, Oscar, *Faire campagne Tassel*.—Schultz, Oscar, *Zum Guiteclin*.—Schultz, Oscar, *Noch einmal Perceval Doria*.—Reichel, George, *Zur Datierung von Adam de la Hales Singspiel Li gieu de Robin et de Marion*.—Fraenkel, Ludwig, *Zu 'Molière in Deutschland,' nebst einer Textvariante seiner Promotionskarikatur*.—*Beurteilungen und kurze Anzeigen*.—Wasserzieher, E., *Gustav Meyer, Essays und Studien zur Sprachgeschichte und Volkskunde. II.*—Schmidt, Max C. P., *J. Freid, Schulgrammatik der nhd. Sprache. 12. Aufl.*—Speyer, Fr., *Cours gradué de langue allemande par J. Bayard et M. Plate*.—Wasserzieher, E., *Konrad Duden, Etymologie der nhd. Sprache mit ausführlichem etymologischem Wörterverzeichnis*.—Schmidt, M. C. P., *Seb. Brant, Luther, Hans Sachs, Fischart mit einer Auswahl von Dichtungen des 16. Jahrh. Mit Anmerkungen von Dr. L. Pariser*.—Gloede, O., F. Galle, *Der poetische Stil Fischarts*.